

A GRAMMAR
OF THE
CLASSICAL ARABIC LANGUAGE,
TRANSLATED AND COMPILED FROM THE WORKS
OF THE
MOST APPROVED NATIVE OR NATURALIZED AUTHORITIES.

~~~~~  
BY MORTIMER SLOPER HOWELL,

H. M.'S BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE,  
Member of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and Fellow of the University of Calcutta, and of  
Anjuman-i-Punjab  
~~~~~

UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE GOVERNMENT, N.-W. PROVINCES.

IN AN INTRODUCTION AND FOUR PARTS.

The Introduction: and Part I.-The Noun.

Book 2



ALLAHABAD:

PRINTED AT THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES AND OUDH GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1886.

CORRECTIONS.

P. 131 *A*, *l.* 17. For "AF" throughout this Note read "LM".

P. 132 *A*, *ll.* 2-3. Read "on Monday the 12th of Rabi' alAwwal "

l. 4. Read "and 12 days".

NOTICE.

PAGES XXV-XXVI of the Contents and 87A-88A of the Notes are to be substituted for the corresponding pages given in the 1st Fasciculus of Part I.

M. S. HOWELL.

The 14th July, 1886.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

P. xxv, l. 23. Read "*cop.*"

P. xxvii, l. 2. Read "*met.*"

P. xxviii, l. l. Read "explanation"—*ibid.* Read ^{أفعل}.

P. xxix, l. 21. Read "latent"—*l. 29.* Read "*pron.*"—*l. 31.* Read "*gen.*"—*l. l.* Read "*pron.*"

P. xxxi, l. 19. Read "in the"—*ibid.* Read "574".

P. xli, l. 16. Read ^{ويب}.

P. xlii, l. 22. Read ^{ويث}.

P. li, l. 1. Read "form of the *sing.*"

P. 638, l. 2. R here enters upon the discussion of the methods allowable in interrogation with ^{من} about a mentioned rational *det.*, in which case the ordinary method is to repeat the *det.*, putting it in the *nom.* after ^{من}; so that, when a man says ^{أخا زيد} or ^{أيت زيد}, you say ^{زيد من} or ^{أخو زيد} Who is Zaid or the brother of Zaid?

P. 698, l. 12. Before "proper" insert "[generic]"—*l. 14 and 17.* For "[proper]" read "[personal proper]".

P. 703, l. 16. "their likes" are *preps.*

P. 760, l. 18. For "(i.e." read "[i.e."

P. 93A, l. 20 and l. 29. Read "*l. l.*"

P. 94A, l. 10. Read "*l. l.*"

P. 95A, l. 19. Read "if her".

P. 96A, ll. 2-3. Read "AlYaman" and "dependont"—*l. 19.* Read ^{ألتيا} and ^{ألتيا}.

P. 98A, l. l. Read "transmits".

P. 104A, l. l. Read "and inceptive [423], an answer".

P. 114A, l. 17. Read "context"—*l. l.* Read "not au".

P. 115A, l. 1. Read "*pron.* as".

P. 117A, l. 13. Read "His"—*ll. 13-14.* Put "His name my knowledge" within marks of quotation.

P. 130A, l. l. Put a comma after "him".

P. 131A, l. 1. Read "One of".

P. 132A, l. 25. Read "AlMaṣṣūr".

Additions and Corrections to the Abbreviations of References.

* AKB. The *Khizānat alAdab wa Lubb Lubāb Lisān al'Arab* (c. 1073—1079), an Exposition of the evidentiary verses cited in the Commentary of R' upon the IH, by the Shaikh 'ABD ALKĀDIR Ibn 'Umar ALBAGHDĀDĪ, resident of Cairo, the Philologist (b. 1030, d. 1093), printed at Bulāk in 1292.

* Amr. The Gloss (c. 1188) of the Shaikh Muḥammad ALAMĪR alAzhari upon the ML, printed in Egypt in 1299.

* CD. The Commentary of Khfj upon the D, cited from extracts given in Thorbecke's Notes on the D, and latterly from the edition printed at Constantinople in 1300.

* D. The *Durrat alGhawwāṣ* by H, edited by Thorbecke, and printed at Constantinople with the Commentary of Khfj.

* EC. The Commentary of the SAYYID MUḤAMMAD Ibn 'Alī Ibn AlḤusain alMūsawī al'Āmilī alJubā'ī, the Philologist (b. 946, d. 1009), upon the evidentiary verses of the C, cited from an incomplete MS.

[The Author is so named in the LB, p. 42, and in the preface to the EC. The *Amal alĀmil*, as noticed in the LB, wrongly attributes the work to the Sayyid Ḥusain (d. 1069), son of the Sayyid Muḥammad.]

* FA. The *Fawā'id alKalā'id fī Mukhtaṣar Sharḥ ashShawāhid*, commonly called *AshShawāhid aṣṢughrā*, an abridgment of the MN, by its Author, cited from a MS.

[The HKh. IV. 393 calls it the *Farā'id alFawā'id*.]

* Khfj. The *Raiḥānat alAlibbā wa Zahrat alḤayāt adDunya*, a Biographical Dictionary of Contemporary Celebrities, by Maulānā the Ḳāḍī Shihāb adDīn Aḥmad Ibn Muḥammad ALKHAFAJĪ alMiṣrī alḤanaṣī, the Philologist (d. 1069), printed in Egypt in 1294.

* Khls. The *Khulāṣat alAthar fī A'yān alḲarn'alḤādī-'Ashar*, a Biographical Dictionary of the Celebrities of the 11th Century, by the Maulā MUḤAMMAD ANIN Ibn Faḍl Allāh ALMUḤIBBĪ, great-grandson of MDE, alḤamawī by origin, adDimashkī by birth and abode, alḤanaṣī, the Historian and Philologist (b. 1061, d. 1111), printed in Egypt in 1284.

* LB. The *Zu'lu'atū alBahrain fī-Ijāzat li-Kurratayī-l-'Ain* (c. 1182), a Series of Biographies of the Learned Men of AlBahrain, by the Shaikh Yūsuf Ibn Aḥmad Ibn Ibrāhīm adDarāzī alBAḤRĀNĪ, the Philologist (b. 1107), lithographed at Bombay.

MDE. The *Ḳaḍī Muḥibb adDīn Abu-l Faḍl Muḥammad Ibn Taḳī adDīn Abi Bakr al-'Ulwānī alḤamawī* by birth and education, adDimashḳī alḤanafī, known as MUḤIBB ADDĪN EFFENDĪ, the Philologist (b. 949, d. 1016), great-grandfather of the Author of the Khls.

* MN. The Commentary named *Al-Maḳāṣid an-Naḥwīya fī Sharḥ Shawāhid Shurūḥ al-'Alfiya*, commonly called *Ash-Shawāhid al-Kubrā* (c. 806), by the *Ḳaḍī Badr adDīn Abū Muḥammad Maḥmūd Ibn Aḥmad asSarūjī alḤanafī*, known as AL-'AINĪ, born at 'Ain Tāb, the Jurist and Grammarian (b. 762, d. 855), upon the evidentiary verses cited in the Commentaries of BD, IUK, IA, and IHsh upon the IM, printed upon the margin of the AKB.

* N. The Commentary named *Tanzīl al-Āyāt 'ala-sh-Shawāhid min al-Abḳāt*, by MDE, upon the evidentiary verses of the K, edited by Abu-lWafā Naṣr alḤarīnī, and printed at Bulāḳ in 1281.

* NA. The *Nuzhat al-Alibbā fī Ṭabaḳāt al-Uḍabā*, a Treatise on the Classes of the Philologists, by KIAmb, printed in Egypt in 1294.

* SD. The *Silk adDurar fī A'yān alḲarn ath-Thānī-'Ashar*, a Biographical Dictionary of the Celebrities of the 12th Century, by the Sayyid Ṣadr adDīn Abu-lFaḍl MUḤAMMAD KHALĪL EFFENDĪ Ibn 'Alī Effendī alMurādī alBukhārī adDimashḳī an-Naḳshbandī, the Historian and Philologist, printed at Bulāḳ in 1301 from a MS written at Damascus in 1211.

- agreement of the *pre.* and *post. ns.* in number and gender is a condition of such government ... 451—465
- § 150. The *subst.*—definition given by IH—the *subst.* after $\bar{\text{J}}$ how included in this definition—definition given by IM and IHsh—classification—best construction in the case of the *subst.* of blunder—the *subst.* of pure blunder or of forgetfulness not allowable in poetry ... 465—468
- § 151. The *ant.* is subsidiary to the mention of the *subst.*—but is not meant to be rejected—refutation of the theory that it is virtually rejected as regards the sense—and as regards the letter ... 468—469
- § 152. The *op.* of the *ant.* is virtually repeated with the *subst.* ... 469
- § 153. The *subst.* and *ant.* need not agree in determinateness and indeterminateness—but may be both *det.*, both *indet.*, or one *det.* and the other *indet.*—the *indet. subst.* for a *det.* ought to be qualified—application of this rule ... 469—471
- § 154. The *subst.* and *ant.* are both explicit *ns.*, both *prons.*, or one an explicit *n.* and the other a *pron.*—the partial *subst.* and the *subst.* of implication need a pronominal *cofi.*—omission of the *cop.*—theory that the $\bar{\text{J}}$ may supply the place of the *pron.*—or that the suppression of the *pron.* may be explained by holding the *subst.* to be treated as a *corrob.*—the total *subst.* does not need a *cop.*—the *interrog.* Hamza prefixed to the *subst.* for an *interrog. n.*—the *v. a subst.* for the *v.*—anacoluthon—order of the *subst.* and other *appos.*—suppression of the *ant.* ... 471—478
- § 155. Syndesis—the *synd. expl.*—the other *appos.* how excluded by this definition—the *synd. expl.* must be *prim.*—its concord with the *ant.*—dispute as to whether the *synd. expl.* and its *ant.* may be *indets.*—the *synd. expl.*, being like the *ep.*, must contain the generic $\hat{\text{J}}$ when its *ant.* is a *dem.*

- but is allowed by S to be anarthrous when the *dem.* is a *voc.*—and by S and Zd to consist of 2 *sings.* coupled together when the *dem.* is a *du.*—the latter construction disallowed by S, Zd, and others in the *ep.*—but allowed by S when the *du.* is a *voc.* ... 478—481
- § 156. The *synd. expl.* how distinguishable from the *subst.*—either allowable—the *synd. expl.* necessary—the *subst.* necessary—differences between them—R's theory of their identity—explanation of their alleged differences—*exs.* where either is admissible—suppression of the *ant.* ... 481—491
- § 157. Definition of the coupled—defence of the definition—the coupled is separated from its *ant.* by a *con.*—the *ep.* is sometimes coupled to an *ep.* ... 491—492
- § 158. Coupling to the attached *nom. pron.*—to the detached *nom. pron.*, and attached or detached *acc. pron.*—to the *gen. pron.*—discussion as to whether the *gen.* is coupled to the *gen.*, or the *op.* and *gen.* to the *op.* and *gen.*—and whether the coupled is governed in the *gen.* by the first *op.* or the second—repetition of the genitival *op.* not necessary in a case of necessity—nor, according to some, in a case of choice ... 492—498

CHAPTER V.—THE UNINFLECTED NOUN.

- § 159. Definition of uninflectedness—definitions of the *uninfl. n.*—its predicament—it is permanent or accidental—the cause of its uninflectedness according to Z—and according to IM—when the *pre. n.* gains uninflectedness from the *uninfl. post.*—allowable uninflectedness of the vague *n.* of time *pre.* to a *prop.*—permanent uninflectedness of *ns.* necessarily *pre.* to a *prop.*—terminations of the *uninfl. n.*—names of the terminations—distribution of the terminations—classification of the *uninfl. ns.* ... 499—505

THE PRONOUNS.

- § 160. The *pron.* is called *emt.* by the KK—its definition—its exponent—positions where it relates to an expression posterior literally and in natural order—choice of exponent when determined by proximity—the explicit *n.* substituted for the *pron.*—the *pron.* is (1) attached, (a) prominent or (b) latent, (2) detached ... 506—511
- § 161. The *pron.* is *uninfl.*—its terminations—reason of its uninflectedness—some *prons.* are common to 2 or more cases—there are *prons.* for all 3 cases—which are attached, and which detached—assortment of the *prons.* with reference to case and attachment or detachment—meanings of each sort—expressions constituted for the attached *nom. prons.* of each *pers.*—and for the remaining sorts of *prons.* of each *pers.*—aggregate of words and meanings—the ت—its variations—the ت in the variations of اَيْنَكْ^{اے} attached *nom. pron.* of the 3rd *pers.*—the ت in ضَرَبْتَ and ضَرَبْتَ^{اے} a *p.*, not a *pron.*—the ا, و, and ن—the و, sometimes used for irrational objects—the ا, و, and ن seldom *ps.*—the ی—attached *nom. pron.* in the *aor.*, *imp.*, and *prohib.*—in the *eps.*, i. e. *act.* and *pass. parts.* and assimilate *ep.*, and in the verbal *ns.* and *adv.*—detached *nom. pron.*—اَنَا^{اے}—فَحْنُ^{اے}—ی^{اے} and هُوَ^{اے}—اَنْتَ^{اے} اَنْتِ^{اے}—ی^{اے} and هُوَ^{اے}—their, ی^{اے} and هُوَ^{اے}—vocalized, elided, made quiescent, or doubled—*du.* and *pl.* of the detached *nom. pron.* of the 3rd *pers.*—the detached *nom. prons.* are common to the *pret.*, *aor.*, *imp.*, and *eps.*—expressions constituted for the attached *acc.* and *gen. prons.* of each *pers.*—vowel of the ı in the *sing. masc.*—impletion, slurring, or elision of this vowel after a mobile—slurring or impletion of the vowel

- after a quiescent—summary of the *dial. vars.* in the z of the *sing. masc.* after a Kasra or quiescent ي —impletion, slurring, or elision of the vowel of the z in the *sing. masc.* when a soft letter is elided before the z —vowel of the z in the *du.* and *pl.*—quiescence or vocalization of the p of the *pl.* after the z pronounced with Kasr, and impletion of its vowel when it is followed by a mobile—summary of the states of the p after the z pronounced with Kasr—states of the p after the z pronounced with Damm—detached *acc. pron.*—its constitution—*gen. pron.*—it must be attached, and is exactly like the attached *acc.*—the ي , ك , and z when *objs.* and when *post.*—the ك in زيدك زيدك , when a *p.* and when a *post. n.*—*pl.* of magnification—*pl. masc.* for *sing. masc.* or *sing. fem.*—*sing.* for *pl.*—the *pron.* treated like the *dem.* ... 511—532
- § 162. اِيَّاي and its variations ... 532—533
- § 163. Detachment of *nom.* or *acc. pron.* not allowable except when attachment is impossible—rules for attachment and detachment when *nom.* or *acc. pron.* is governed (1) by a *v.*—(2) by something else ... 533—539
- § 164. Rules for attachment and detachment when 2 *prons.* follow an *op.*, (1) when the *op.* is a *v.*, (a) if the 2nd *pron.* be an *appos.*—(b) if the 2nd *pron.* be not an *appos.*—(2) when the *op.* is a *n.*—attachment or detachment of pronominal *pred.* of كان , etc. ... 540—544
- § 165. No *pron.* latent except attached *nom.*—cause of its latency—attached *nom. pron.* when not apparent—*ag.*, explicit or pronominal, when not apparent—*explanation* of instance where *ag.* of أَفْعَل

seems to be apparent as a detached *pron.*—*ag.*
when apparent as an explicit *n.* or detached
pron.—explanation of instances where *ag.* of

أَفْعَلٌ seems to be apparent as an explicit *n.*, and
ag. of نَفْعَلٌ as a detached *pron.* of the 2nd *pers.*
or as an explicit *n.* 544—516

166. Form of detached *nom. pron.* intervenes between
inch. and *enunc.* before and after prefixion of
their *lit. ops.*—is named distinctive by the BB,
and support by the KK—the *ل* of inception is
prefixed to it—the *inch.* ought to be *det.*, and the
enunc. synarthrous—the distinctive remains fixed
in case, but varies in number, gender, and
pers.—is introduced where the *enunc.* is anar-
throus, but an أَفْعَلٌ of superiority—conditions of
the *pron.* named distinctive and support—its
import—some Arabs make it an *inch.*, and what
follows it its *enunc.* 546—551

- § 167. The *pron.* of the case or *fact*—named *pron.* of the
unknown by the KK—is (1) attached, (a) pro-
minent or (b) latest, (2) detached—when *fem.*—
may not be suppressed, except when an *acc.*—
exs. of its suppression when *sub.* of أَنْ—its
irregularities—the *expos. prop.* after it must
have both its terms expressed—must be nominal,
except when an annuler of inchoation is prefixed
to the *pron.*—and must be enunciatory, except
when *pred.* of the contracted أَنْ 551—554

- §. 168. The *prop.* in رَجُلًا، رَجُلًا، and رَجُلًا 554

- § 169. The *pron.* after كَرَلًا and عَسَى —analysis of كَرَلًا
followed by a *gen. pron.*—and of عَسَى followed
by an *acc. prop.* 555—557

- § 170. The *ن* of *protection* or *support*—why introduced into the *v.*—inseparable from all paradigms of the *v.* except the 5 paradigms of the *aor.* containing the *ن* of inflection—may be elided with the *ن* of inflection, but not with the *ن* of the *pron.*, nor with the single or double *ن* of corroboration—dispute whether the elided be the *ن* of protection or the *ن* of inflection—the *ن* of the *pron.*, or the single or double *ن* of corroboration not elided with the *ن* of protection—the *ن* of protection elided with the *ن* of the *pron.* by poetic license—methods allowable with the *ن* of inflection—expression or omission of the *ن* of protection with *عَسَى* and *لَيْسَ*—with the *أَنْعَلَ* of wonder—with verbal *ns.*—with *أَنَّ*, *لَكِنَّ*, *أَنَّ*, *كَلَّا*—with *لَعَلَّ*—with *قَطَّ*, *قَدْ*, *عَنْ*, *مِنْ*—*لَيْتَ*—*لَكِنَّ*—with *بَجَلَّ* ... 557—562
- § 170A. Degrees of particularity in the *prons.*—the more particular prevails over the less ... 562

THE DEMONSTRATIVES.

- § 171. Definitions—the *dems.* contain the sense of *vs.*—demonstrate *orig.* only sensible and visible objects—their numbers, genders, and cases—the *sing. maso.* used for the *sing. fem.* or *du. fem.*—similar usage in the *pron.*—the *dems.* are *uninfl.*—their terminations—reason of their uninflectedness—dispute on the uninflectedness of the *du.*—similar dispute on the *du.* of the conjunct—*ذَٰلِكَ*, *أَلْذَٰلِكَ*, and the like are *quasi-*

- du. ns.*, not real *qus.*—ذَانِ , تَانِ , اَللَّذَانِ , and اَللَّتَانِ occur in all 3 cases—the *dems.* are vague, and must therefore be explained by an *ep.* when they are likely to confuse ... 563—570
- § 172. The ك of allocution is affixed to them to notify [by its variations] the number and gender of the person addressed—it is a *p.*, not a *pron.*—does not indicate person, but only allocution—varies with the number and gender of the person addressed—aggregate of *dems.* so formed—the ك is invariable in one *dial.*—ذَلِكَ for ذُلُكُم 570—572
- § 173. The ل is inserted before the ك to indicate the *distance* of the demonstrated—distinction in meaning between ذَا , ذَاكَ , and ذُلِكَ—some make no distinction between ذَاكَ and ذُلِكَ—numbers and genders of the *dems.* importing *distance*—reduplication of the ن in ذَانِ and هَذَانِ—and in ذَانِكَ and تَانِكَ—the ل when omitted—always omitted in the *dial.* of Tamīm 572—674
- § 174. The premonitory *p.* هَا is prefixed to the *dems.*—هَذَا and its variations—هَذَاكَ and its variations—the هَا is not part of the *dem.*—explanation of هَذَانِ as an *acc.* ... 574—576
- § 175. *Dems. of place*—هَـنَا and هُنَا—هَـنَا is always used as an *adv.*—and so هُنَا—the ك of allocu-

tion is affixed, and the premonitory هَا prefixed, to هُنَا and هُنَا, but not to تَمَّ — and the ل is inserted—distinction in meaning between هُنَا, هُنَا, and هُنَا — تَمَّ and هُنَا are like هُنَا in meaning—هُنَا, هُنَا, and هُنَا sometimes denote *time*—dispute as to whether they are then *pre.* to the *prop.*

576—578

THE CONJUNCTS.

- § 176. اَلَّذِي and its variations—the *sing.*—reduplication or elision of the ي in the *sing.*—the ا and ل in all 3 numbers are *red.*—added to impart the form of the *det.*—the *du.*—reduplication of the ن in the *du.*—similar reduplication in the *du.* of the *dems.*—elision of the ن in the *du.*—dispute as to whether the *dus.* are *infl.* or *uninfl.*—اَلَّذَانِ and اَلَّذَيْنِ occur in all 3 cases—the *pl. masc.*—اَلَّذَيْنِ written with one ل—elision of the ن from اَلَّذَيْنِ and اَلَّذَيْنِ—other forms of the *pl. masc.*—the *pl. fem.*—conjuncts common to all genders and numbers—اَلْ—مَا—مَنْ—مَنْ expressly or constructively *pre.* to a *det.*—sometimes femininized, dualized, and pluralized—the Ta'i تُو—its *dial. vars.*—ذَا—the conjuncts, with some exceptions, are *uninfl.*—their terminations—reason of their uninflectedness—the conjunct ought to be *infl.*—the *conj.* has not a place in inflection—nor have the conjunct and its *conj.* together—the conjuncts are vague

579—590

§ 177. Definition of the conjunct—its *conj.*, except the *conj.*

of $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —the *rel.*—the *conj.* is a verbal, nominal, *cond.*, or adverbial *prop.*—this *prop.* must be enunciatory—and needs a *cop.*—the *pers.* of the

rel. pron.—the *conj.* of $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —it is constructively a verbal *prop.* containing a *rel. pron.*—its *o. f.*—it

receives the inflection properly belonging to $\hat{\text{أ}}$

—anomalous *conjs.* of $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —they prove $\hat{\text{أ}}$ not to be a *p.* of determination, but are peculiar to poetry—the *prim.* synarthrous substantive as a conjunct—the *conj.* or part of it does not precede the conjunct—nor does the *conj.* or any thing depending upon it govern what precedes the conjunct—nor does the *conj.* depend upon what precedes the conjunct—nor is the conjunct separated from the *conj.*, or part of the *conj.* from part, by an *appos.* or *enunc.* of, or *exc.* from, the conjunct—in poetry a conjunct occurs coupled to a conjunct before the *conj.*—sometimes a conjunct is separated from its *conj.* by a *reg.* of the *conj.*—such separation is not allowable

with a conjunct *p.*, nor with the conjunct $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —part of the *conj.* may be separated from part by something coupled to the *conj.*—part of the *conj.* precedes part—suppression of the conjunct

n. other than $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —of the *conj.* of the conjunct

n. other than $\hat{\text{أ}}$ —the *rel.* of $\hat{\text{أ}}$ may not be suppressed—nor may one of two *rels.* when combined in the *conj.*—suppression of the *rel.* in other cases

... ..

590—606

§ 178. $\hat{\text{أ}}$ is 3 connective to the qualification of *deta.*

by *props.*—the fact announced by the *conj.* *prop.* ought to be known to the person addressed

—distinction between the *conj.* and the attribute—**الَّذِي** and its *sem.* are lightened by elision of the **ي** alone or with the preceding vowel—the **ن** is elided from its *du.* and *pl.*—its *sing.* is used to indicate the *pl.*—number of the *rel. pron.* in that case 606—608

- § 179. **الَّذِي** has a wider range in the process of enunciation than **أَلِ**—an *enunc.* is not made to **أَلِ** except from a *n.* in a verbal *prop.*—conditions requisite in the *v.*—enunciation is a process instituted for examination and exercise of the student—when permissible—method of effecting it—concord of the conjunct in number and gender with the *n.* made an *enunc.*—latency or detachment of the *pron.* governed in the *nom.* by the *qual.* occurring as *conj.* of **أَلِ**—conditions of the *n.* that an *enunc.* is made from—enunciation when disallowed 608—614

- § 180. **مَا**—the **مَا** that follows an *indet.* to import *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness*—**مَا** denotes mostly the *irrational*, sometimes the *rational*, often the *qualities of the rational*, sometimes the *unknown in quiddity and essence.* 614—619

- § 181. Its **ا** is subject to conversion and elision—conversion of the **ا** — **مَهْمَا** — **مَهْمَا** — **مَهْمَا** is simple, not compounded—its meanings—elision of the **ا** with retention or elision of the Fatha—the **ا** is elided in interrogation, but expressed in enunciation—the **ا** is expressed in interrogation in extraordinary readings and poetic licenses, not in ordinary readings—the **ا** is not elided when the *interrog.* **مَا** is compounded with **لَا** — **مَا** when written conjoined and when disjoined 619—627

- § 182. ^أمِنْ — ^أمِنْ as a complete *indet.* or *red.*— ^أمِنْ mostly denotes the *rational*, sometimes the *irrational*— ^أمِنْ and ^أمَا are literally *sing. masc.*, but are applied to all numbers and genders—observance of the letter is more frequent in expressions made to accord with them than observance of the sense—observance preferable or necessary—precedence of, and reversion to, observance of the letter when the two observances are combined— ^أمِنْ when written disjoined, and when conjoined 627—633
- § 183. In interrogation with ^أمِنْ about a mentioned rational *indet.* 3 methods are allowable in pause upon ^أمِنْ, (1) to imitate in ^أمِنْ the inflection of the *indet.* and the signs of its number and gender—the letters of prolongation are added in the *sing. masc.*—imitation of the inflection is omitted in the *sing. fem.* and *pl. fem.*—the ن before the ت is made quiescent in the *du. fem.*, and sometimes in the *sing. fem.*, but is sometimes mobilized in the *du. fem.*—(2) to add the letters of prolongation, imitating only the inflection appropriate to the *sing. masc.*, whatever be the number and gender of the *indet.*—(3) to put ^أمِنْ alone in every state without imitation—imitation allowed by Y in continuity— ^أمِنْ is *infl.* in some *dials.*—the signs mentioned are affixed only at the end of the sentence—question how put when the rational and irrational are combined—methods allowable in interrogation with ^أمِنْ about a mentioned rational *det.*—and about a *rel. ep.* of a proper name 634—643

- § 184. ^وأَي as a qualified *indet.*—^وأَي when decidedly aprothetic—^وأَي is *infl.*, except in vocation—the *interrog.* or *cond.* ^وأَي is *infl.* unrestrictedly—the conjunct ^وأَي has 4 states—the conjunct ^وأَي when *infl.*, and when *uninfl.* upon Damm—conditions of the *op.* of the conjunct ^وأَي ... 643—646
- § 185. In interrogation with ^وأَي about a mentioned *indet.* 2 methods are allowable, (1) to imitate in ^وأَي the inflection of the *indet.* and the signs of its number and gender—reason and pause why required as conditions of imitation with ^وأَي, and not with ^وأَي—(2) to restrict oneself in continuity to inflecting ^وأَي in the *sing.*, whatever be the number and gender of the *indet.*—the vowels and other signs affixed to ^وأَي and ^وأَي in the state of imitation are imitative alliterations, these words being in the place of a *nom.* by inchoation—in interrogation with ^وأَي about *dets.* what follows it is not imitated—the *n.* is sometimes imitated without a question—imitation is allowable, according to this *dial.*, in *dets.* after ^وأَي or ^وأَي ... 646—648
- § 186. The *dems.* as conjuncts — مَاذَا — ذَا ... 648—651

THE VERBAL NOUNS AND EJACULATIONS.

- § 187. Definition of the verbal *n.* given by IH—definition given by IM and Fk—expressions excluded by the latter definition—mood and tense indicated by the verbal *n.*—the verbal *ns.* are *uninfl.*—

their terminations—reason of their uninflected-ness—meaning of the term “verbal *ns.*”—object of using them—they are shorter and more intensive than *vs.*—what they indicate—why they are not called *vs.*—their *o. fs.*—they are all transferred from original *inf. ns.*, from *inf. ns. orig. vs.*, from *adv.*, or from *preps.* and *gens.*—**أَمِين** or **أَمِينٌ**—its forms—the *prep.*

and *gen.* why called a verbal *n.*—the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection—it is not in the place of the *nom.*—it has lost its original place in inflection—nor is it in the place of the *acc.*—it is transferred from its original meaning to the meaning of the *v.* in the same way as proper names are transferred—it denotes the *meaning*, not merely the *expression*, of the *v.*—the *v.*

sometimes becomes a verbal *n.*—**كَذَّبَ** and

كَذَّبَ عَلَيْكَ—government of the verbal *ns.*—the **ب** is often *red.* in their *obj.*—dispute as to whether they may be preceded by their *accs.*—the verbal *n.* is not *pre.*—the *aor.* is not governed in the *subj.* in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.*, but is governed in the *apoc.*—the verbal *ns.* are mostly i. q. the *imp.*—are more intensive and *corrob.* in meaning than the corresponding *ns.*—and, when enunciatory, contain the sense of *wonder*—they have no sign for the attached *pron.* governed by them in the *nom.*—affixion of the **ك** of allocution and of the Tanwin to them is restricted to hearsay—the **ك** attached to them is sometimes a *n.* governed in the *gen.*, and sometimes a *p.* of allocution—according to the majority, the Tanwin affixed to them indicates *indeterminateness*—the verbal *ns.* in the state of determination belong to the

class of *n.* made *det.* by the ^{اَلْ} denoting *knowledge*—according to ISk and Jh, the Tanwin affixed to verbal *ns.* indicates that they are continuous with what follows them, not paused.

upon—classification of the verbal *ns.*—^{اَرُوْ} —

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

وَيْكَ — وَيْ — وَاَهَا — وَا — بَجَلْ — قَطَا — قَدْ

§ 188. ^{اَرُوْ} —ambiguous constructions and various versions ... 674—676

§ 189. ^{اَرُوْ} —is made uniform by the Hijāsts in all numbers and genders, but conjugated by the Banū Tamīm as an *imp. v.*—is *trans.* and *intrans.* —
... 676—678

§ 190. ^{اَرُوْ} —its *dial. vars.*—three of these are aplastic *vs.* ... 679—680

§ 191. ^{اَرُوْ} — its *dial. vars.*—forms peculiar to pause —
— sense and government of ^{اَرُوْ} —
its assumption of the *pron.* — ^{اَرُوْ} —
and ^{اَرُوْ} why combined—^{اَرُوْ} used alone—
^{اَرُوْ} or ^{اَرُوْ} used alone ... 680—684

§ 192. ^{اَرُوْ} is (1) a verbal *n.*—(2) an *inf. n.*—^{اَرُوْ} —
(3) a *n. i. q.* ^{اَرُوْ} —case of what follows it—
nature of its *Fath.*—*ex.* with versions exhibiting
all 3 constructions—^{اَرُوْ} or ^{اَرُوْ} —
^{اَرُوْ} occurs in tradition—different versions of
this tradition—(4) a *prep.* ... 684—686

§ 193. **فَعَالٍ** — it is (1) an *imp.* verbal *n.*—universal, or, at all events, frequent, in the *tril.*—its occurrence in the Revelation—it is rare in the *quad.*, being then **فَعَالٌ** — refutation of the theory that it is made to deviate from the verbal *imp.* for the sake of *intensiveness* and is *fem.*—it is intensive, however, like all verbal *ns.*—so are **فَعَالٍ** the *inf.* *n.* and **فَعَالٍ** the *ep.*—(2) an *inf.* *n.*—refutation of the theory that it is made to deviate from a *det. fem. inf. n.*—there is no evidence of determinateness in **فَعَالٍ** — nor in other instances of this **فَعَالٍ** — vacillation of the GG about the gender of all the measures of **فَعَالٍ**, *imp.*, *inf. n.*, *ep.*, and proper name—(3) a *fem. ep.*—this *ep.* does not occur in the *masc.*, is always used without a qualified, and is of 2 kinds, (a) used only in the *voc.*, except by poetic license—this kind, like the *imp.* **فَعَالٍ**, may be regularly formed from every *tril. att.* completely plastic *v.*—and does not occur as a generic proper name—(b) used in the *non-voc.*, (a) mostly as generic proper names, and therefore *det.*—(b) sometimes merely as *eps.*—(4) a personal proper name of a *fem.*—this kind of proper name is coined—difference between it and the generic proper name mentioned in 3, b, a—it is always *fem.*—but is sometimes used as a name for a man ...

687—698

§ 194. **فَعَالٍ** when an *imp.*, *inf. n.*, or *ep.*, has its **ل** pronounced with Kasr—unless it be used as a personal proper name, in which case, if a name for a *masc.*, it is declined as a diptote, and some-

- times as a triptote, and, if a name for a *fem.*, it is treated like **فَعَالٍ** when a personal proper name—the **ل** in the *imp.* is pronounced with Fath by the Banu Asad—the *inf. ns.* and *eps.* are *uninfl.* by common consent—the generic proper names are *uninfl.*—the personal proper names of *fems.* have 3 *dial. vars.* ... 698—701
- § 195. **هَبَاتٌ** — its *dial. vars.*—its number—reasons for the different vowels of the **ت**—the final how written when pronounced with Damm ... 701—703
- § 196. **شَتَّانٌ** — requires 2 *ags.* — **شَتَّانٌ مَا** is allowable —and **شَتَّانٌ مَا بَيْنَ**, though it is less frequent and chaste—but not **شَتَّانٌ بَيْنَ** ... 703—706
- § 197. **أَفٌ** — its *dial. vars.*—its final vowel, and its Tanwin ... 706—707
- § 198. These *ns.* are *det.* and *indet.*—signs of the *det.* and *indet.*—classification of these *ns.* as (1) always *det.*—(2) always *indet.*—**أَيُّهَا** or **أَيْهَ** and **هَيْهَ** — (3) *det.* and *indet.* — **أَيْهَ** — the Tanwin affixed to these *ns.*—theory that the verbal *ns.* are all *det.* ... 707—709
- § 199. *Advs.* and *preps.* as verbal *ns.*—their *gen.* is a *pron.* —*pers.* of the *pron.* — **لَدَيْكَ**, **عِنْدَكَ**, and **مَكَانَكَ** — **أَمَامَكَ** and **وَرَاءَكَ** — **دُونَكَ** — question whether **مَكَانَكَ** and the like are verbal *ns.* — **عَلَى** and **إِلَى** — **إِلَيْكَ** and **عَلَيْكَ** — an explicit *n.* governed in the *gen.* by **عَلَى** — dis-

pute whether *instigation* by *advs.* of place and by *preps.* is regular or restricted to hearsay—position of the *pron.* attached to these words—their *ag.*—case of the *corrob.* after them ... 709—713

- § 200. Definition of the *ej.*—classification of the *ej.*s.—these expressions why named *ej.*s.—they are treated as words, and coordinated with *ns.*—the Tanwīn affixed to some of them—they are all *uninfl.*—reason of their uninflectedness—when they occur constructed, they may be *infl.* or *uninfl.*, inflection being frequent with ^{أَلْ}أَلْ, and necessary with Tanwīn—*ej.*s. imitating the sounds of human beings, dumb animals, or inanimate substances—*ej.*s. wherewith brutes are cried to—*ej.*s. indicative of the speaker's mental states—
^{وَيْسَ}وَيْسَ , ^{وَيْسَ}وَيْسَ , ^{وَيْسَ}وَيْسَ , and ^{وَيْسَ}وَيْسَ — ^{وَيْلَهُ}وَيْلَهُ or ^{وَيْلَهُ}وَيْلَهُ
 — ^{وَيْكَ أَنْ}وَيْكَ أَنْ or ^{وَيْكَ أَنْ}وَيْكَ أَنْ or ^{وَيْكَ أَنْ}وَيْكَ أَنْ ... 713—720

THE UNINFLECTED ADVERBS.

- § 201. Some *advs.* are *uninfl.*—their terminations—the *adv.* cut off from prothesis—enumeration of the *advs.* so cut off—others may not be added by analogy—the *post. n.* or *prop.* when suppressible—reason of the uninflectedness of the *advs.* cut off from prothesis—and of ^{أَيْ}أَيْ , ^{أَيْ}أَيْ , and ^{أَيْ}أَيْ
 —reason of the inflectedness of ^{بَعْضُ}بَعْضُ and ^{كُلُّ}كُلُّ when the *post.* is suppressed—these *advs.* are preferably *uninfl.*, but allowably *infl.* when pronounced with Tanwīn as a compensation for the *post.*—there is no difference in sense between their *infl.* and *uninfl.* forms—contrary opinion that their *infl.* forms do not imply the sense of prothesis—these *ns.* are *uninfl.* upon *Damm* in

1 state, and *infl.* in 3 — ^{مِنْ} ^{أَوَّلِ} — ^{مِنْ} ^{قَدَامِ} —
 Tanwīn with the sign of the *nom.* or *acc.* in
 these *adv.*—they are named “finals”—^{كُلِّ} and
^{بَعْضِ}, when cut off from prothesis, are not so
 named—^{عَلِ} — it is *uninfl.* upon Damm or *infl.*
 —its *dial. vars.*—the ^{يَ} of ^{عَلِ} is elided in ^{عَلِ} —
 vowel of the ^{فِ} in ^{عَلَوْ} —and of the ^{لِ} in ^{عَلَوْ} —
 the finals why *uninfl.* upon Damm—^{لَا} ^{غَيْرِ} or
^{لَيْسَ} ^{غَيْرِ} and ^{حَسْبُ} are treated like the *adv.*
 cut off from prothesis—^{غَيْرِ} — constructions
 allowable with ^{غَيْرِ} preceded by ^{لَيْسَ} — ^{لَا} ^{غَيْرِ} —
 — ^{غَيْرِ} is assimilated to the final *adv.*—but
 only after ^{لَا} and ^{لَيْسَ} — ^{غَيْرِ} after ^{لَيْسَ} is i.q.
^{إِلَّا} — ^{حَسْبُ} — it is used as an *indet. ep.*—and
 as a *prim. substantive*—objection to its being
 a verbal *n.*—^{حَسْبُ} — its *post.* why suppressed
 — ^{حَسْبُ} why *uninfl.* upon Damm—*adv. pre.*
 to *props.*—the *n.* of *time* is generally *pre.* to the
 verbal *prop.*, sometimes to the nominal—the *n.*
 of *time*, when not in sense an *adv.* to the *inf. n.*
 of the *prop.*, is not used except with an infinitival
p. before the *prop.* — ^{ذُو} — ^{أَيَّةَ} and ^{رَيْتَ} —
 order of the two terms of the *prop.* immediately
 following ^{أَيَّةَ} and ^{رَيْتَ} when one of these terms
 is a *v.*—^{غَيْرِ} and ^{مِثْلُ} are sometimes *pre.* to a

prop. headed by an infinitival *p.*—the *adv.* also are said by the KK to be *pre.* to ^{٢٢}أَنْ and ^{٢٢}أَنْ—alleged qualifiability of the *adv. pre.* to *props.*—determinateness or indeterminateness of this *adv.*—the *n.* of *time* or ^{٢٢}حَيْثُ, even if not an *adv.*, is *pre.*

to the *prop.*—^{٢٢}حِينَئِذٍ, ^{٢٢}يَوْمَئِذٍ, and ^{٢٢}سَاعَتَئِذٍ — ^{٢٢}أَيْ — the *post. prop.* may not contain a *pron.*

relating to the *pre. adv.*—the *cop.* when necessary in the *prop.* following an *adv.*—anomalous insertion of a *cop.* in the *prop. post.* to an *adv.*—the *adv.* necessarily *pre.* to *props.* must be *uninfl.* —the *sing.* and *pl.*, but not the *du.*, of the *adv.*

allowably *pre.* to the *prop.* or to ^{٢٢}أَيْ may be

uninfl. upon Fath—so may ^{٢٢}مِثْلُ with ^{٢٢}مَا — and

^{٢٢}غَيْرُ with ^{٢٢}أَنْ or ^{٢٢}أَنْ ... 721—744

- § 202. ^{٢٢}حَيْثُ or ^{٢٢}حَيْثُ is *uninfl.*—its terminations—^{٢٢}حَيْثُ is *infl.* by some—its meaning—how parsed—it does not occur as *sub.* of ^{٢٢}أَنْ — is always *pre.* to a *prop.*, more often verbal—extraordinary prefixion to a single term—more extraordinary prefixion to a suppressed *prop.*—^{٢٢}حَيْثُ, when *pre.* to a single term, is *infl.* by some—^{٢٢}حَيْثُ — proof that ^{٢٢}حَيْثُ sometimes denotes *time* ... 744—748

- § 203. ^{٢٢}مَنْ and ^{٢٢}مَنْ — are peculiar to *time*—their meanings when they are *ns.*—what follows them—how parsed when followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*—are *ns.* when governing a single *n.* in the *nom.*, or when followed by a *prop.*—how parsed when followed

by a *n.* in the *nom.*—or by a verbal or nominal *prop.*—are *uninfl.*—reason of their uninflected.

ness—their terminations—the *o. f.* of ^{أَئِذَا} ... 748—752

- § 204. ^{أَئِذَا} is (1) a *n.* denoting *past time*—how used—(2) a *n.* denoting *future time*—(3) causative—a *p.* or *adv.*, according to different opinions—*exs.* in favor of the 1st opinion—(4) denotative of *suddenness of occurrence*—generally occurring after ^{بَيْنَا} or ^{بَيْنَا} and variously said to be an *adv.* of *place* or *time*, a *p.* denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, and a *red. p.*—2 other meanings mentioned for ^{أَئِذَا}, in both of which it appears to be a *p.*—^{أَئِذَا} is always *pre.* to a *prop.*, nominal or verbal—but is not prefixed to a *n.* followed by a *pret. v.*—suppression of one term of the *prop.*—^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا} and ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا}—and of the whole *prop.*—^{أَئِذَا} or ^{أَئِذَا} and ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا}—^{أَئِذَا} does not denote *condition* unless it be restrained by ^{أَئِذَا} from prefixion—^{أَئِذَا}—a *p.* or *adv.*, according to different opinions—its government of the *apoc.* is rare, but not a poetic license—^{أَئِذَا} (1) denotes *suddenness of occurrence*—this differs from the *cond.* ^{أَئِذَا} in being peculiar to nominal *props.*, in not needing a *correl.*, nor occurring at the beginning of the sentence, and in meaning the *present*—and is variously said to be a *p.*, an *adv.* of *place*, and an *adv.* of *time*—its *op.*, if it be an *adv.*—the *enunc.* with it—^{أَئِذَا} itself the *enunc.*—^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا} regarded as an ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا} or ^{أَئِذَا} ^{أَئِذَا}

adv. of time, but still apparently made *enunc.* of a concrete *n.* — إِذَا هُوَ هِيَ or إِيَّاهَا — this إِذَا is used like the ف in the *correl.* of the condition — (2) denotes *something else* — this differs from the 1st إِذَا in being an *adv. of the future*, in implying the sense of *condition*, and in being peculiar to prefixion to verbal *props.* — tense of the *v.* after it — the *cond.* إِذَا is not prefixed to an *inch.*, whether the *inch.* be, or be not, followed by a *v.* — and does not govern the *apoc.*, except in poetry — exclusion of this إِذَا from *adverbiality*, *futurity*, and *conditionality* — when no longer *cond.*, it may still be followed by 2 *props.* — what governs it in the *acc.*, whether it be *cond.* or *non-cond.* — the ف in the *correl.* of the *non-cond.* إِذَا — the *cond.* إِذَا may have for its *apod.* a nominal *prop.* without a ف — and be followed by a nominal *prop.* devoid of *v.* — حَتَّى إِذَا — إِذَا and إِذَا denoting *suddenness of occurrence* in the *correl.* of بَيْنَمَا and بَيْنَمَا — formation of بَيْنَمَا and بَيْنَمَا — sense and government of بَيْنَ in them — كَلَّمَا — tense of the *v.* after بَيْنَمَا , بَيْنَمَا , and كَلَّمَا — كَلَّمَا and كَلَّمَا here may be *uninfl.* — construction of بَيْنَمَا , بَيْنَمَا , and كَلَّمَا with their 2 *props.* — إِذَا and إِذَا why prefixed to the *correl.* of بَيْنَمَا and بَيْنَمَا — كَلَّمَا and كَلَّمَا in كَلَّمَا

and ^{أَإِذَا} may be *infl.*—parsing of ^{إِذَا} and ^{أِذَا} in the *correl.* of ^{بَيْنَا} and ^{بَيْنَا} —and of ^{إِذَا} in the *correl.* of ^{إِذَا}, ^{لَمَّا}, and ^{إِنْ} — ^{إِذَا} denoting *suddenness of occurrence* elsewhere than in the *correl.* of ^{بَيْنَا} and ^{بَيْنَا} — ^{بَيْنَا} may be *pre.* to an *inf. n.*, contrary to ^{بَيْنَا} 752—778

§ 205. ^{لَدُنْ} ^{عُدْوَةٍ} —its *dial. vars.*—its government—^{لَدُنْ} —no *n.* but ^{عُدْوَةٍ} is governed in the *acc.* after ^{لَدُنْ} — ^{كَدَى} — difference between it and ^{لَدُنْ} —and between it and ^{عِنْدَ} —there is no proof of its uninflectedness—its ! 778—784

§ 206. ^{أَلْقَنَ} — is an *adv.* of time, *uninfl.* upon Fath—the ^{أَلْ} prefixed to it—how it is made *det.*—reason of its uninflectedness—it is sometimes *infl.*—its *vars.* — ^{أَمْسَ} — its termination when it means a *specified day*, and is not *pre.*, nor synarthrous, nor formed into a *du.* or broken *pl.* or *dim.*—its inflection when it is used as a name for a man—and when it means *some day or other of the past days*, or is *pre.* or synarthrous, or is formed into a *du.* or broken *pl.* or *dim.*—its uninflectedness when it is anarthrous, and means a *specified day*, but is used as an *adv.*—^{قَطْ} —its usages—it is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its terminations—its *dial. vars.*—^{عَرَضَ} or ^{عَوَضَ} —its usages—when it is *infl.* and when *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness —its terminations—^{لَمَّا} —it is a *p.*—or an *adv.*

of *time*—reason of its uninflectedness—attempted refutation of its nominality—the *v.* following it—its *correl.*—apparent omission of its 2 *vs.*—
 مَع — له and لا — its formation —
 to be *uninfl.*—reason for its uninflectedness—it is really *infl.*—the ا in مَع — اَيْنَ — is *uninfl.*—
 its termination — مَتَى — is also a *p.* or a *n. syn.* with وَسَطَ — is *uninfl.*—its termination — اَيْنَمَا —
 and مَتَى — distinction between مَتَى and اَيْنَا —
 اَيْنَا — اَيْنَ — is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination—its derivation—its *dial. vars.*—parsing of *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* and the like—the *enunc.* of the *cond. inch.*—the *correl.* of the *cond. inch.* needs a *cop.*—the *interrog.* or *cond. reg.* of the *v.* or its like must precede its *op.*—the *op.* of مَتَى and every *cond. adv.* ...

785—804

- § 207. كَيْفَ is a *n.*—treated as an *adv.* by many—dispute as to whether it be an *adv.* or a plain *n.*—how renderable—its usages—said to occur as a *con.*—is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination — اِنِّى — كَيْفَ — condition of its occurrence in the sense of كَيْفَ or مَتَى — it is *uninfl.*—reason of its uninflectedness—its termination

804—810

THE COMPOUNDS.

- § 208. IH's definition—includes such as سَيِّئِيَّةٌ — excludes such as عِبْدُ اللهِ and قَابِطُ شَرٍّ — excludes part of the defined also—amendment of the definition—classification of the *comps.*—dispute as to classification of certain *comps.* ...

811—812

	Page.
§ 209. Distinction between the 2 kinds of <i>comp.</i> ...	812—813
§ 210. The <i>num.</i> exceeding 10—the ع of عَشْر sometimes made quiescent—this <i>num.</i> , when synarthrous or <i>pre.</i> , remains <i>uninfl.</i> —dispute as to uninflectedness of the <i>pre.</i> —treatment of this <i>num.</i> when used as a name for a man ...	813—814
§ 211. Classification of the synthetic <i>comps. uninfl.</i> upon Fath—all synthetic <i>comps.</i> used as <i>ds. s.</i> —synthetic composition in what is not an <i>adv.</i> or <i>d. s.</i> — o. f. of حَيْضُ بَيْضُ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> ...	814—818
§ 212. خَاَزِ بَاَزِ — its <i>dial. vars.</i> and meanings ...	818—820
§ 213. بَانِي بَدَا or بَانِي بَدِي — is used as a <i>d. s.</i> —its <i>dial. vars.</i> ...	820
§ 214. اَيْلِي سِبَا or اَيْدِي سِبَا — its <i>dial. vars.</i> —is a <i>d. s.</i> — —the Hamza of سِبَا omitted ...	820—821
§ 215. حَضْرَمَوْت, قَالِي قَلَا — its <i>dial. vars.</i> —مُعْدِيكَرِب, مُعْدِيكَرِب, and the like—the ي of مُعْدِي, when <i>pre.</i> , is made quiescent in the <i>acc.</i> كَرِب in مُعْدِي كَرِب —dispute as to classification of قَالِي قَلَا ...	821—822

THE UNINFLECTED METONYMS.

§ 216. Definition of metonymy—signification of the <i>met.</i> denoting an <i>expression</i> —all the <i>interrog.</i> and <i>cond.</i> <i>ns.</i> are <i>met.</i> ,—being used for <i>unlimited particular</i>

things—all *mets.* are not *uninfl.*—the *uninfl. mets.*
—the *interrog.* and *cond. ns.* why not reckoned
here—the *mets.* are like the *adv.* in being *infl.*
and *uninfl.* 823—825

§ 217. $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — is *interrog.* and enunciatory—both denote
number and *numbered*, and each needs a *sp.*—
case and number of the *sp.*—points of agreement
between the *interrog.* and enunciatory—and of
difference 825—827

§ 218. Parsing of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ 827—828

§ 219. Suppression of the *sp.* 828—829

§ 220. Number of the *sp.* of the *interrog.* $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — of the *n.*
coupled to the *sp.* of the *interrog.*—of the *sp.* of
the enunciatory 829—830

§ 221. Separation of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ from its *sp.*—case of the *sp.* of the
separated *interrog.* $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — and of the *sp.* of the
separated enunciatory $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ —treatment of the *sp.*
of the separated enunciatory $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$, when the separa-
tion is by a *trans. v.*—and of the *sp.* of the
separated *interrog.* $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$, when the *sp.*, if $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ were
not separated from it, would be governed in the
gen. 830—831

§ 222. Number and gender of $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ —and of the *pron.* relat-
ing to it—this *pron.* ought not to be *du.* ... 832

§ 223. $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ is peculiar to *indets.*—apparent determination of
its *sp.*—and of the *n.* coupled to its *sp.* ... 832—833

§ 224. Case of the *sp.* of the *interrog.* $\overset{\wedge}{\text{ك}}$ — the *gen.* when
allowable in this *sp.*—the *sp.* of the enunciatory

- ^اكَمْ is sometimes governed in the *acc.* without separation—^اكَمْ عَمَّ ... 833—835
- § 225. The *sp.* how governed in the *gen.* when ^اكَمْ is *interrog.* —and when ^اكَمْ is enunciatory—^امِنْ prefixed to the *sp.*—^اكَمْ when construed to be pronounced with Tanwīn ... 835—836
- § 226. كَذَا and ^اكَيْن — points of agreement between كَذَا and ^اكَمْ — and of difference— كَذَا as a *met.* for the expression occurring in narration—the uncompounded كَذَا — هَذَا — points of agreement between ^اكَيْن and ^اكَمْ — and of difference— *dial. vars.* of ^اكَيْن ... 836—840
- § 227. ذَيْتٌ and كَيْتٌ — their terminations—their pausal form—they are often used according to the *o.f.*— ^اكَمْ — reason of their uninflectedness—they are always repeated with the *con.* ۛ — distinction between them ... 840—841

CHAPTER VI.

THE DUAL NOUN.

- § 228. Definition of dualization—and of the *du.*—*o.f.* of the *du.* and *pl.*—corresponding definition of the *du.*—demonstration of the theory that the *o.f.* is coupling—coupling when allowable instead of dualization—*multiplication* sometimes denoted by repetition without coupling or by dualization—conditions of dualization—*ns.* not dualized—exceptions to some of these conditions—classifi-

cation of the *du.*—the form for the *sing.* is generally preserved—elision of the ة of femininization—of the ن of the *du.*—and of its ل ... 842—846

§ 229. The form of the *sing.* when unaltered in the *du.*—and when altered—dualization of the abbreviated, when its ل is 3rd—different opinions on the mode of converting the *rad.* ل and the ل whose *o. f.* is unknown—modes allowable when the ل has 2 *o. fs.*—dualization of the abbreviated when its ل is 4th or upwards—مُذَرَّان — elision of the ل in the *du.* of the abbreviated transcending 4 letters—تَهَقَّرَان and خُذِرْلَان — summary of the rules for converting the ل of the abbreviated in the *du.*—summary of the anomalous *du.* in the abbreviated ... 846—850

§ 230. The *ns.* whose final is Hamza are prolonged and unprolonged—definition of the prolonged—its Hamza—dualization of the prolonged when its Hamza is (1) substituted for the ل of femininization—(2) *rad.*—(3) denotative of co-ordination and (4) converted from a *rad.* , or ي — كَسَائِيَان — elision of the ل and Hamza of femininization—summary of the anomalous *du.* in the prolonged—definition and dualization of the unprolonged ... 850—853

§ 231. Dualization of the *n.* arbitrarily curtailed of its final—the *n.* whose ل is elided for a necessitating cause ... 853—855

§ 232. Dualization of the *quasi-pl.* and of the broken, but not ultimate, *pl.*—dualization is easier in the *quasi-pl.* than in the broken *pl.*—and is not allowable in the ultimate *pl.* ... 855—856

§ 233. Number preferred in the <i>pre.</i> , (1) when 2 parts are literally or ideally <i>pre.</i> to their 2 wholes, (a) if the 2 wholes be uniform in letter—the <i>du.</i> disapproved unless omission of dualization would lead to ambiguity—the <i>pl.</i> why preferred to the <i>sing.</i> —difference of opinion as to the number allowable when each whole contains more than one of each part— <i>ex.</i> of the <i>du.</i> and <i>pl.</i> , and <i>ex.</i> of the <i>du.</i> —(b) if the 2 wholes be separated by a <i>con.</i> —(2) when the <i>pre.</i> is not part of the <i>post. du.</i> —number of the <i>pron.</i> , <i>qual.</i> , <i>dem.</i> , and the like, belonging to the <i>pre. n.</i> whose letter differs from its sense—the <i>sing.</i> substituted for the <i>du.</i> or <i>pl.</i> —the <i>du.</i> for the <i>sing.</i> —the <i>pl.</i> for the <i>sing.</i> or <i>du.</i> — <i>ex.</i> of the <i>sing.</i> and <i>pl.</i> for the <i>du.</i>	856—861
--	-----	-----	-----	---------

CHAPTER V.

THE UNINFLECTED NOUN.

§ 159. Uninflectedness is the inseparability of the termination of the word from one state, literally or constructively, like the inseparability of هُوَ لَا from Kasra, مَنْذ from Damma, and اَيْنَ from Fatha (Sh). The *uninfl. n.* is the one whose final's quiescence or vowel is not by reason of an *op.* (M, MM). The *uninfl. [n. (Jm)]* is what (1) is related to the *orig. uninfl.*, [vid. the *p.*, *pret.* *v.*, and *imp.* without the *ج*, which relation is detailed (below) by the author of the M (Jm)] ; (2) occurs unconstructed: [being of 2 kinds, either *uninfl.* from the lack of the motive for inflection, vid. construction, like *ns.* enumerated, as اَلْفَ بَا تَا تَا (321), وَاحِدٌ اِثْنَانٌ ثَلَاثَةٌ, and زَيْدٌ ; or *uninfl.* from the presence of the preventive of inflection, notwithstanding the existence of the motive for it, that preventive being resemblance (of the *n.*) to the *p.*, *pret.*, or *imp.*, or its being a verbal *n.* (187) (R):] and its predicament is that its termination does not vary because of the variation of the *ops.* (IH). It is (1) permanent, vid. (a) what implies the sense of the *p.*, like اَيْنَ [206], مَتَى [below], and كَيْفَ [207]; (b) what resembles it, like اَلَّذِي [below], اَلَّتِي, and the like : (2) accidental, vid. (a) the [*n.*] *pre.* to the *ي* of the 1st pers. [129], as غُلَامِي [below]; (b) the aprothetic *det.*

voc., as ^{أَ}يَا ^{زَيْدُ} [48]; (c) the aprothetic *indet.* with the generic *neg.* ^{لَا}, as ^{لَا} رَجُلٌ فِي الدَّارِ [99]; (d) the *comp.*, as ^{خَمْسَةَ} عَشْرَ [210]; (e) what the *post.* is suppressed from, vid. ^{أَ}قَبْلَ , ^{أَ}بَعْدَ , ^{أَ}فَوْقَ , ^{أَ}تَحْتَ , and the rest of the 6 relative locations [128, 201] (MM). The cause of its uninflectedness is its relation to what has [*orig.* (AAz)] no declinability in any way, near or remote, [like the *pret. vs.*, *imp.* of the 2nd *pers.*, and *ps.*, which are *orig.* so constituted as to have no declinability, contrary to the *uninfl. ns.*, whose indeclinability is adventitious, not original (AAz),] through (1) implying its sense, like ^{أَ}أَيُّ and ^{أَ}أَمْسٍ [206]; (2) resembling it, like the [*prons.* (161) and] vague *ns.* [262]; (3) occurring in its place, like ^{أَ}نَزَالِ [193]; (4) conforming to what occurs in its place, like ^{أَ}فَجَارِ and ^{أَ}فَسَاقِ [194]; (5) occurring in the place of what resembles it, like the *voc.* pronounced with Damm [48]; (6) being prefixed to it, as in LXX. 11. [below] and ^{أَ}هَذَا يَوْمٌ لَا ^{أَ}يَنْطَلِقُونَ LXXVII. 35. *This will be a day when they shall not speak* in the readings with Fath [of the م (AAz)], ^{أَ}لَمْ يَمْنَعْ الشَّرْبَ ^{أَ}أَلْخَ [90], and

عَلَى حِينٍ عَاتَبْتُ الْمَشِيبَ عَلَى الصَّبِيِّ
وَقُلْتُ أَلَمْ أَصْغِ وَالْمَشِيبَ وَأَزْعِ

by AnNābigha (M) adhDhubyānī, *At the time when I reproved hoariness for the passing away of youth, and said, What! have I not yet become sober when hoariness is hindering (from sport)?* (J). The cause of uninflectedness is restricted to resemblance to the *p.*, according to IM, who mentions that the *n.* resembles the *p.* in (1) constitution, as when the *n.* is constituted of (a) one letter, like the ت in ضَرَبْتُ [161]; (b) two letters, like the ُ in أَكْرَمْنَا^{٢٤}: (2) sense, vid. what resembles a *p* (a) existing, like مَتَى [206], which is used to denote *interrogation*, like the Hamza, and *condition*, like أَى^{٢٥}; (b) non-existent, like هُنَا^{٢٦}, because *demonstration*, being a meaning, ought to have a *p.* constituted to indicate it [171], so that the *dems.* are *uninfl.* because of their resemblance to a supplied *p.*: (3) acting as a *subst.* for the *v.* and not being impressible by the *op.*, like the verbal *ns.*, as دُرَاك [193], which is *uninfl.* because of its resemblance to the *p.* in governing and not being governed by anything else; but this is based upon the opinion that the verbal *ns.* have no place in inflection [187]: (4) permanent need, like the conjunct *ns.*, as أَلَّذِي [176], which, always needing the *conj.* [177], resemble the *p.* in permanence of need [497] (IA). The [*pre.* (DM)] *n.* gains uninflectedness [from the *post.*, when *uninfl.* (DM),] by prothesis [111], when the *pre.* is (1) vague, [but not a *n.* of time (DM),] like

رَحِيلَ بَيْنَهُمْ وَبَيْنَ دُونَ, whence رَحِيلَ بَيْنَهُمْ وَبَيْنَ [رَحِيلَ] , and مَثَلٌ , غَيْرُ [رَحِيلَ] , XXXIV. 53. *And their union and the union of what they shall long for shall be obstructed and*
 وَمِنَّا دُونَ ذَلِكَ LXXII. 11. *And of us is the inferior of that*, as Akh says, the reading لَقَدْ تَقَطَّعَ بَيْنَكُمْ VI. 94. *Assuredly your union hath become dissevered*, as Akh says, which is confirmed by the reading with the *nom.*, LI. 23. [518], the reading أَنْ يُصِيبَكُمْ مَثَلٌ مَا أَصَابَ XI. 93. *That the like of what befell [the people of Noah &c.] should befall you*, وَأَنْ مَا مِثْلُهُمُ الْخ [107], and لَمْ يَمْنَعْ [107], and لَمْ يَمْنَعْ : whereas, if the *pre.* be not vague, it is not *uninfl.*; while the saying of Jz and those who agree with him, that [the *pre. n. in*] غَلَامِي [above] and the like is *uninfl.*, is refuted, [because غَلَامٌ is not a vague *n.* (DM),] and [because it (DM)] entails uninflectedness of [the *pre. n. in*] غَلَامُكُ and غَلَامَةٌ, which no one maintains : (2) a vague [*n. of*] time, the *post.* being (a) أَنْ , as وَمِنْ خِزْيٍ XI. 69. *And We saved them from the ignominy of that day* and مِنْ عَذَابٍ يَوْمَئِذٍ LXX. 11. *From the chastisement of that day*, both read with the *gen.* and Fath of يَوْمٍ ; (b) an *uninfl. v.*, whether the uninflectedness be original, as in عَلَى حِينٍ عَاتَيْتُ الْخ , or adventitious [402, 406], as in

لَا جُنْدَيْنَ مِنْهُمْ قَلْبِي تَحَلُّمًا * عَلَى حِينٍ يَسْتَصْبِيحِينَ كُلَّ حَلِيمٍ

[*I will surely draw away from them my heart, by endeavouring to acquire staidness, at the time when they seek to be fool every staid man (Jsh)*], both related with Fath [of حِينٍ (DM)], which is superior to inflection according to IM, and inferior according to IU: whereas, if the *post.* be an *infl. v.* or nominal *prop.*, the BB say that inflection is necessary; but the correct view is that uninflectedness is allowable, whence the reading of Nāfi 'هَذَا يَوْمَ الْآخِ' V. 119. [1], the reading of others than Abū 'Amr and Ibn Kathir 'يَوْمَ لَا تَمْلِكُ نَفْسٌ' LXXXII. 19. (*It is*) the day when a soul shall not have in its power, [i. e. هُوَ يَوْمٌ الْآخِ (DM),]

إِذَا قُلْتُ هَذَا حِينٍ أَسْلُو يَهِيْجُنِي
نَسِيمُ الصَّبَا مِنْ حَيْثُ يَطْلُعُ الْفَجْرُ

[by Abū Ṣakhr al Hudhālī, *When I say "This is the time when I shall forget", the breeze of the east wind from where the dawn rises stirs me (Jsh)*], and

أَلَمْ تَعْلَمِي يَا عَمْرُكَ إِلَهَ أَنْبِي * كَرِيمٍ عَلَى حِينِ الْكَرَامِ قَلِيلٍ

[*Dilst thou not know (O, I pray God to prolong thy life!) that I am generous at the time when the generous are few? (Jsh)*], both [verses] being related with Fath

(ML) of حِين (DM). The vague [n. of] time, i. e. what does not indicate any time particularly, as وَقْتُ حِين, سَاعَةُ حِين, and زَمَانُ حِين, may be *pre.* to the *prop.*; and then may be *infl.* or *uninfl.* upon Fath, uninflectedness being preferable to inflection when the *post.* is a verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is *uninfl.*, and the converse being the case when the *post.* is a verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is *infl.* or a nominal *prop.* (Sh). Such *ns.* as are necessarily *pre.* to the *prop.* are permanently *uninfl.*, because of their resemblance to the *p.* in needing the *prop.*, like اِنْ, حَيْثُ, and اِذَا [115] (IA). Uninflectedness upon quiescence is the general rule (M, IA), because it is lighter than the vowel (IA): and deviation from it to the vowel is only for one of three causes, (1) to avoid [irregular (AAz)] concurrence of two quiescents [663], as in هُوَلَا; (2) not to begin with a quiescent, literally or predicamentally, as in the two ك s, that which is i. q. مَثَل [509], and that which is a *pron.*, [as in اَكْرَمْتِك, because it is in the predicament of detachment, as being an objective complement, without which the *v.* and *ag.* are complete (AAz)]; (3) [to indicate (AAz)] accidental uninflectedness, as in خَمْسَةَ عَشَرَ, مِنْ قَبْلُ, لَا رَجُلَ فِي الدَّارِ, يَا حَكَمَ, [because, being *orig. infl.*, they are vocalized to distinguish between the permanently and accidentally *uninfl.* (AAz)]. The quiescence of uninflectedness is named

pause ; and its vowels Damm, Fath, and Kasr (M). Uninflectedness upon Kasr and Damm is found in the *n.* and *p.* [497] ; and uninflectedness upon Fath and quiescence in the *n.*, *v.* [402], and *p.* [497] (IA). The *uninfl. ns.* [except such as may be anomalous or have been previously mentioned (M)] comprise [7 *cats.* (M),] the *prons.*, the *dems.*, the conjuncts, the verbal *ns.* and *ejs.*, some of the *adv.*, the *comps.*, and the *met.* (M, IH).

THE PRONOUNS.

§ 160. The *pron.*, named by the KK *met.*, is what indicates (1) a 1st pers., as ^{أنا} *I* and ^{نحن} *We*: (2) a 2nd pers., as ^{أنت} *Thou* and ^{أنتم} *Ye two*: (3) a 3rd pers., as ^{هو} *He* or *It* and ^{هما} *They two*, (a) known, as ^{أنا أنزلناه} XCVII. 1. *Verily We sent it down* [433]: (b) prior, (a) unrestrictedly, as XXXVI. 39. [504]; (b) literally, but not in natural order, as ^{وَأَن ابْتَلَىٰ أَبْرَاهِيمَ رَبَّهُ} II. 118. *And when his Lord tried Abraham*; (c) in intention, as ^{فَارْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً مُّوسَىٰ} XX. 70. *And Moses conceived fear in his mind*: (c) posterior, unrestrictedly, in such as ^{قُلْ هُوَ اللَّهُ أَحَدٌ} CXII. 1. *Say thou, It, i. e. The case* [167], *is this* [27], *God is one* [609], XLV. 23. [539], ^{نَعَمْ رَجُلًا زَيْدٌ} *Most excellent is he as a man, Zaid* [469], ^{رَبَّهُ رَجُلًا} [168], ^{قَامَا وَقَعَدَا أَخَوَاكَ} [22], ^{ضَرْبَتَهُ زَيْدٌ} [154], and ^{جَزَىٰ رَبَّهُ أَلْحَ} [20]; but the soundest opinion is that this [last] is a poetic license. The *pron.* must have an exponent explaining what is meant by it. If it denote a 1st or 2nd pers., its exponent is the presence of the person that it belongs to. If it denote a 3rd pers., its exponent is (1) not an expression, as XCVII. 1., i. e. *the Kur'ān*, whose celebrity and independence of exposition are thus attested: (2) an expres-

sion, (a) mostly prior, (a) literally and constructively, as XXXVI. 39.; (b) literally, but not constructively, as II. 118.; (c) constructively, but not literally, as XX. 70.: because ^أأَبْرَهِيْمُ, being an *obj.*, is meant to be understood as *postpos.*; and ^ممُوسَى, being an *ag.*, is meant to be understood as *prepos.*: (b) sometimes posterior literally and in natural order (Sh). The positions where the *pron.* relates to an expression posterior literally and in natural order are 7, vid. where the *pron.* is (1) governed in the *nom.* by ^ننَعَمْ or ^ببُئْسَ, in which case it is expounded only by the *sp.*, as ^ززَيْدٌ ^ننَعَمْ رَجُلًا and ^ععَمْرُو ^ببُئْسَ رَجُلًا; while the ^ففَعْلٌ that *praise* or *blame* is intended by [468] is coordinated with them, as VII. 176. [(475), orig. ^سسَوَاءٌ (DM)], ^ككَبِيرَتٌ XVIII. 4. *How great it is as a word that proceedeth!*, and ^ززَيْدٌ ^ظظَرُفٌ رَجُلًا *How clever he is as a man, Zaid!*: but, according to Fr and Ks, the particularized is the *ag.*, and there is no *pron.* in the *v.*, which is refuted by ^ززَيْدٌ ^ننَعَمْ رَجُلًا كَانَ *Such that most excellent was he as a man was Zaid!*, the annuller not being prefixed to the *ag.*, [but to the *inch.* (DM)]; and by the particularized's being sometimes suppressed [473], as ^ببُئْسَ لِلْظَّالِمِينَ بَدَلًا [473], as a substitute for God, (Iblis and his offspring), [i. e. ^إإِبْلِيسُ ^ووَنَزَرِيَّتُهُ (B)], the *ag.* not being suppressed (DM)]: (2)

governed in the *nom.* by the 1st of 2 contending *ops.* the 2nd of which is made to govern, as

جَفَوْنِيْ وَلَمْ أَجِفْ الْإِخْلَاءَ إِنِّي
لَغَيْرِ جَمِيلٍ مِنْ خَلِيلِيْ مُهْمَلٌ

[*They behaved unkindly to me, and I behaved not unkindly to the friends: verily I am indifferent to unkindness from my friends (Jsh)*] : (3) predicated of [by a single term (DM)], in which case it is expounded by its *enunc.* or *pred.*, as ^{XXIII. 39.} *It, i. e. Life, is not aught save our lower life, orig., says Z* [followed by B], ^{ابن الحيوة} *إِنِّي هِيَ إِلَّا حَيَاتُنَا الدُّنْيَا* : (4) the *pron.* of the *case and fact*, [which is the *pron.* predicated of by a *prop. expos.* of it (DM),] as ^{CXII. 1.} *and* ^{فَإِذَا هِيَ شَاخِصَةٌ} *فَإِذَا هِيَ شَاخِصَةٌ* ^{XXI. 97.} *Lo, it, i. e. the fact, will be this, staring will be the eyes of them that have disbelieved:* (5) governed in the *gen.* by ^{رَبِّ} *رَبِّ* [505], in which case its predicament is the same as that of the *pron.* of ^{نَعَمَ} *نَعَمَ* and ^{بِئْسَ} *بِئْسَ* in that its exponent must be a *sp.*, and it itself must be *sing.*, as

رَبَّةٌ قَتِيَّةٌ دَعَوْتُ إِلَى مَا * يُوْرِثُ الْمَجْدَ دَائِبًا فَاجَابُوا

[*Many youths have I called to what entails glory perpetually, and they have answered! (Jsh)*] ; but it is always

masc., as رَبَّةٌ امْرَأَةٌ, not رَبِّهَا, whereas نَعِمْتُ امْرَأَةً هندية [474] is said: (6) followed by an explicit *subst. expos.* of it, as ضَرْبُهُ زَيْدًا; and thus are explained اَللَّهُمَّ اَلْحِمْ him, *the pitiful, the merciful* and قَدْ اَصْبَحْتُ بِقَرْقَرَى اَلْحِمْ him, *the wretch* [156], قَامُوا اِخْوَتَكَ, [21], قَامَا اِخْوَاكَ, and قَمِيَ نِسْوَتَكَ: (7) attached to a prior *ag.*, its exponent being a posterior *obj.*, as ضَرْبُ غُلَامَةٍ زَيْدًا, allowed by Akh and IJ, whence كَسَا حِلْمَةَ اَلْحِمْ and وَلَوْ اَنْ مَجِدًا اَلْحِمْ [20]; but the majority hold that in prose the *obj.* in the case of that [*pron.* attached to the *ag.* and relating to the *obj.* (DM)] must be prior, as II. 118. (ML). When 2 or more possible exponents precede, the exponent is the nearest, as جَاوَنِي زَيْدٌ وَبَكْرٌ فَضْرِبْتَهُ, i. e. *I beat Bakr*; but with [an explanatory] context may be the farthest, as جَاوَنِي عَالِمٌ وَجَاهِلٌ فَكُرِمْتَهُ (R). In وَمَا سَعَادُ اَلْحِمْ [149] the *o. f.* is وَمَا هِيَ, the explicit *n.* being then made to act as a *subst.* for the *pron.*, which is facilitated by their being in 2 opposite *props.*, [nominal and verbal,] and in 2 verses, [the 1st of which بَانَتْ اَلْحِمْ is in §-22.,] and separated by a *prop.* [فَقَلْبِي اَلْحِمْ]; and by the fact that repetition of the beloved's name is delighted in: and inferior to it is the saying of AlḤuṭai'a

أَلَا حَبْدًا هِنْدٌ وَأَرْضٌ بِهَا هِنْدٌ

Now dearly loved are Hind and a land that Hind is in, because they are in one *prop.*; repetition of the explicit *n.* in one *prop.* being good only on the occasion of magnifying, as وَأَصْحَابُ الْيَمِينِ مَا أَصْحَابُ الْيَمِينِ LVI. 26. And the companions of the right hand, what etc.? [29]; or aweing, as LXIX. 1. 2. [27] (BS). AlFind azZim-mānī says

مَشِينًا مَشِيَّةَ اللَّيْلِ * غَدَاً وَاللَّيْلِ غَضْبَانٌ

We stalked (towards them) with the stalk of the lion, when he has come forth early, the lion being wrathful (from hunger), repeating: اللَّيْلِ in the [same] verse, and not putting its *pron.*, for the sake of solemnity and awe; and they do that in the case of generic *ns.* and proper names, as says 'Adī Ibn Zaid

لَا أَرَى الْمَوْتَ يُسَبِّقُ الْمَوْتَ شَيْءٌ
نَغْصَ الْمَوْتُ ذَا الْغَنَى وَالْفَتِيرَا

- (T) I see not death to be such that ought outstrips death: death has troubled the life of the wealthy and the poor (Jsh). The *pron.* is (1) attached, [which is {inseparably (M)} attached (M, R) to its *op.* before it, being like a supplement to that *op.* and like some of its letters (R): and is (a) prominent, vid. what is expressed, like the ك in أُخْرَى; (b) latent, vid. what is meant to be understood,

ٓ, as نَلْنَا , فَاتْنَا , and بَنَا ; (b) the ى , as اِضْرِبِى [402],
 اَكْرَمْنِى [170], and مَرِّبِى ; (c) هُمْ , as قَاتِلُون , هُمْ ,
 اَكْرَمُهُمْ , and لَهُمْ : but ٓ denotes the *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*
 while the meaning is one, and is an attached *pron.* in
 the 3 cases ; whereas the ى , though used to denote the
nom., *acc.*, and *gen.*, and an attached *pron.* in the 3 cases,
 is not of one meaning in the 3 cases, because in the *nom.*
 it denotes the 2nd *pers.*, and in the *acc.* and *gen.* the 1st ;
 and هُمْ , though of one meaning in the 3 cases, is in the
nom. a detached *pron.*, and in the *acc.* and *gen.* an at-
 tached *pron.* (IA). The *pron.* is *nom.*, *acc.*, and *gen.*,
 [because it occupies the place of the explicit *n.* (R, Jm)] :
 the 2 first being [each (Jm)] attached and detached ;
 and the 3rd only attached, [because the attached is like
 the last part of its *op.* in that they are not separable (160),
 while the *gen.* is so likewise (158), since separation of
 the *pre.* and *post.*, though allowable in poetry (125),
 being bad with the explicit *n.*, is not regarded in the
 constitution of the *pron.* (R)]. The *pron.* is, therefore, of
 5 sorts, (1) [the attached *nom.*, (like) the *pron.* of the
pret. act. (Jm)] ضَرَبْتُمْ , ضَرَبْنَا , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُمْ ,
 ضَرَبْتُمْ (Jm), ضَرَبُوا , ضَرَبْنَا , ضَرَبَا , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُمْ , ضَرَبْتُمْ
 to ضَرَبْنِى ; and [analogously of the *pass.* (Jm)] ضَرَبْتُ to
 اُنْتُ , نَحْنُ , اَنَا : (2) [the detached *nom.* (Jm),] اُنْتُ , نَحْنُ , اَنَا

(Jm),] to ^{أَنْتَ} أَنْتَ , ^{أَنْتِ} أَنْتِ , ^{أَنْتُمْ} أَنْتُمْ , ^{أَنْتُنَّ} أَنْتُنَّ , ^{هُوَ} هُوَ , ^{هِيَ} هِيَ , ^{هُمَا} هُمَا , ^{هُنَّ} هُنَّ (Jm),] to
 (3) [the attached *acc.*, which is attached to the *v.*, as
 (Jm)] ^{ضَرَبْتُ} ضَرَبْتُ , ^{ضَرَبْتَنِي} ضَرَبْتَنِي , ^{ضَرَبْتُكَ} ضَرَبْتُكَ , ^{ضَرَبْتُكِ} ضَرَبْتُكِ , ^{ضَرَبْتُمَا} ضَرَبْتُمَا , ^{ضَرَبْتُنِي} ضَرَبْتُنِي ,
 (Jm),] to ^{ضَرَبْتَهُ} ضَرَبْتَهُ , ^{ضَرَبْتَهَا} ضَرَبْتَهَا , ^{ضَرَبْتَهُمَا} ضَرَبْتَهُمَا , ^{ضَرَبْتُنِي} ضَرَبْتُنِي ;
 and [to something else, as (Jm)] ^{أَنْتَ} أَنْتَ , ^{أَنْتِ} أَنْتِ , ^{أَنْتُمْ} أَنْتُمْ ,
 (4) : ^{أَنْتَهُ} أَنْتَهُ (Jm), etc.,] to ^{أَيْكَ} أَيْكَ , ^{أَيْكِ} أَيْكِ , ^{أَيْكُمَا} أَيْكُمَا ,
 [the detached *acc.* (Jm)] ^{أَيْكَ} أَيْكَ , ^{أَيْكِ} أَيْكِ , ^{أَيْكُمَا} أَيْكُمَا ,
 (5) : ^{أَيَّاهُ} أَيَّاهُ (Jm), etc.,] to ^{غُلَامِي} غُلَامِي , ^{غُلَامُنَا} غُلَامُنَا ,
 [the attached *gen.*, which is attached to the *n.*, as (Jm)] ^{غُلَامُكَ} غُلَامُكَ (Jm), etc.,] to ^{غُلَامَهُ} غُلَامَهُ ; and [to the *p.*, as (Jm)]
 (IH). ^{لِي} لِي (IH). Each of these 5
 sorts denotes 18 meanings, because each of them denotes
 a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd *pers.*; and these 3, being each *sing.*,
du., or *pl.*, become 9 ; and each of the 9 is *masc.* or *fem.*:
 so that 6 [meanings] belong to the 1st *pers.*, 6 to the 2nd,
 and 6 to the 3rd (R); and by analogy the *prons.* of each
pers. should be 6 in number (Jm). But the Arabs con-
 stitute (1) for the 1st *pers.* 2 expressions, that indicate
 [the (R)] 6 meanings [mentioned (R)], as ^{ضَرَبْتُ} ضَرَبْتُ and
^{ضَرَبْتَنِي} ضَرَبْتَنِي , [the *pron.* of (Jm)] ^{ضَرَبْتُ} ضَرَبْتُ being common to
 the *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, and [the *pron.* of (Jm)]
^{ضَرَبْتَنِي} ضَرَبْتَنِي to the *du.* and *pl.*, *masc.* and *fem.*: [(a) they make

the 1st *pers.*, *sing.* or otherwise, common to the *masc.* and *fem.*, because of the rarity of ambiguity in the 1st *pers.*: (b) they coin a form, vid. ^{أَنتَ}, as likewise is the case with ^{نَحْنُ}, for the *du.* and *pl.* of the 1st *pers.*, and do not add an *l* for the *du.* and *و* for the *pl.*, as they do in the *du.* and *pl.* of the 2nd and 3rd *pers.*, because, when told to distribute ^{أَنْتُمْ} and ^{أَنْتِ}, you say ^{أَنْتَ} ^{يَا} ^{زَيْدَ} ^{وَأَنْتِ} ^{يَا} ^{عَمْرُو} and ^{أَنْتِ} ^{يَا} ^{زَيْدَ} ^{وَأَنْتِ} ^{يَا} ^{عَمْرُو}, whereas, when told to distribute ^{نَحْنُ}, you say, when you mean the *du.*, ^{أَنَا} ^{وَزَيْدُ} or ^{أَنَا} ^{وَزَيْدُ}, and, when you mean the *pl.*, ^{أَنَا} ^{وَزَيْدُ} or ^{أَنَا} ^{وَهُوَ} ^{وَأَنْتِ}, each of its individuals not being ^{أَنَا}; so that, since the condition of the *du.* and *pl.*, vid. agreement of the 2 or more *ns.* in letter is not realized (in the 1st *pers.*), the constituents of its *du.* and *pl.* do not agree with those of the other *dus.* and *pls.*; and therefore they coin a form for the *du.*, and make it common to the *pl.* because of the security from ambiguity owing to the sight (of the persons meant): (c) the great man sometimes says ^{نَحْنُ}, ^{فَعَلْنَا}, and ^{أَيَّانَا}, reckoning himself to be like a multitude (R)]: (2) for the 2nd *pers.* 5 expressions, 4 proper, [vid. ^{ضَرَبْتَ}, ^{ضَرَبْتِ}, ^{ضَرَبْتُمْ}, and ^{ضَرَبْتُنَّ} (R)]; and 1 common to the *du.* *masc.* and *fem.*, [vid. ^{ضَرَبْتُمَا} (R)]: (3) for the 3rd *pers.*

the same assortment as for the 2nd, [as ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبَ , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُ , and ضَرَبْتُ (R),] the *pron.* [in ضَرَبْتُ and ضَرَبْتُ (Jm)] being the 1 common to the 2 *du.*; [whereas the 2 *prons.* supplied in ضَرَبَ and ضَرَبْتُ must be different one from the other, like the detached *prons.* هُوَ and هِيَ (R)]. The rest of the 5 sorts follow this course, i. e. the 1st *pers.* has 2 expressions, the 2nd 5, and the 3rd 5, the total being 12 words denoting 18 meanings (R, Jm); so that the aggregate of the 5 sorts is 60 words denoting 90 meanings (Jm). The ت made mobile in the endings of *vs.* is a *pron.*, as قُمْتُ , قُمْتُ , and قُمْتُ (ML). They pronounce the ت (1) of the 1st *pers. sing.* with Damm, because of the affinity of Damma to the vowel of the *ag.*: (2) of the 2nd *pers. sing.* (a) in the *masc.* with Fath, for distinction between it and the 1st *pers. sing.* and for alleviation; (b) in the *fem.* with Kasr. They add م before the 1 of the *du.* in تُمَا and م of the *pl. [masc.]* in تُمُو , in order that the *du.* may not be confounded with the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* when its Fatha is impleted because of unbinding, nor the *pl.* with the 1st *pers. sing.* whose Damma is impleted: the م being the letter most suitable for addition, because the unsound letters are deemed heavy before the 1 and م; while the م is the nearest of the sound letters to the unsound ones, because it is nasal and labial like the م, for which reason what

precedes it is pronounced with Damm, like what precedes the **و**. Elision of the **و** of the *pl.* with quiescence of the **م**, if not immediately followed by a *pron.*, is commoner than retention of the **و** preceded by Damm, because the **و** at the end preceded by Damm is deemed heavy [721]; whereas, if the **م** of the *pl.* be followed immediately by a *pron.*, as ^{و و و}ضربتكم^و, the Damm and **و** must be restored, because, the [subsequent] *pron.* being through its attachment like one of the letters of the word, the **و** as it were does not occur at the end. The **م** of the *pl.*, when met by a quiescent after it, is pronounced with Damm, because it is restored to its *o. f.*; but Kasr of it is allowed, as will be shown [in the 2nd ^{و و و}ضربتكم below]. A **ن** doubled to correspond with the **م** and **و** in the *masc.* is added for the [*pl.*] *fem.*, the **ن** being chosen from its resemblance, as being nasal, to the **م** and **و** together, while all 3 are letters of augmentation [671] (R). A strange fact about the **ت** is that it is divested of *allocution*, [the *allocution* understood from the **ك** being held sufficient (DM),] and is invariably *sing. masc.*, [even though the party addressed by the expression containing it be *du. masc.* or *fem.*, *pl. masc.*, *sing. fem.*, or *pl. fem.*, as (DM)] in ^{و و و}ارايتم^و, ^{و و و}ارايتم^و [560], ^{و و و}ارايتم^و, and ^{و و و}ارايتم^و, since, if they said ^{و و و}ارايتم^و ^{و و و}ارايتم^و, they would combine 2 *allocutions* [in one sentence (DM)]; whereas, when they abstain from combining them in ^{و و و}يا غلامكم^و, so that they do not say it, as they say ^{و و و}يا غلامنا^و

and ^{يَا غُلَامَهُمْ}, notwithstanding that in the ^{غُلَام} the allocation is adventitious because of the vocation, [not original (DM),] and that ^{يَا غُلَامَكُمْ} is an address to two [different parties], not to one, this is more fit [to be disallowed, because the allocution in it is original, not adventitious, and the party addressed by it is one, not two (DM)], while ^{يَا غُلَامَكِيَّةَ} [55] is allowable only because the lamented is not really addressed (ML), but merely grieved over (DM). The [attached *nom.*] *pron.* of the 3rd *pers. sing. masc. and fem.* is latent [165], because, since the exponent of the 3rd *pers.* is *orig.* a prior expression, contrary to those of the 2nd and 3rd *pers.*, they mean the *prons.* of the 3rd *pers.* to be shorter than those of the 2 others : so that they begin in the 2 *sings.* with the extreme of abbreviation, *vid.* supplying without expressing anything ; and restrict themselves in the *du. masc. and fem.* to the , which is the sign of dualization in every *du.* ; and in the *pl. masc.* to the , which is sometimes dispensed with by the aid of the Damma in poetic license, as

وَلَوْ أَنَّ الْأَطِبَّاءَ كَانُوا حَوْلِي * وَكَانَ مَعَ الْأَطِبَّاءِ الْأَسَاءَةُ

[And, if it were the case that the physicians were around me, and the surgeons were with the physicians, *orig.* ^{كَانُوا} (Jsh)], because the , preceded by Damm is deemed heavy at the end ; and [in the *pl. fem.*] to a single ^{كَانَ} corresponding with the , since it is single. The ^{كَانَ}

in ضَرَبَتْ and ضَرَبَتْهَا is a *p.* denoting femininization [607], not a *pron.*, as is proved by ضَرَبَتْ هَنْدٌ (R). The ا, و, and ي are attached *nom. prons.*, denoting the 3rd *pers.*, as قَامَا الزَّيْدَانِ [20], الزَّيْدُونَ قَامُوا, and الْهِنْدَاتُ قَمْنَ; and the 2nd, as اَعْلَمُوا, اَعْلَمْنَا, and اَعْلَمْنَا; but not the 1st (IA). The و is sometimes used for irrational objects, when treated like rational beings, as يَا أَيُّهَا النَّمْلُ ادْخُلُوا مَسَاكِنَكُمْ XXVIII. 18. *O ye ants, enter etc.* [611], because the allocution is addressed to them, [allocution being addressed only to rational beings (DM)]; but the saying [of AnNābigha alJa'dī (Jsh)]

شَرِبْتُ بِهَا وَالْدِّيكُ يَدْعُو صَبَاحَهُ
إِذَا مَا بُنُو نَعَشٍ دَنُوا فَتَصَوَّبُوا

[*Did I drink of* (the *pron.* in بِهَا relating to the صُهَبَاءُ mentioned in the preceding verse وَالصُّهَبَاءُ الْخَمْرُ *And many a red wine etc.*), *while the cock was crowing in his morning, when the stars in the tail of Ursa Minor had drawn near to the west and set!* (Jsh)] is anomalous, [because allocution is not found in it (DM),] what emboldens him to that being his saying بُنُو, not بَنَاتُ (ML). The ا, و, and ي are seldom *ps.* [21, 497], like the ت of femininization (R). The ي is a *pron.* denoting the [2nd *pers.*]

sing. fem. [402], as ^{قَوْمِي} and ^{تَقْرَمِينَ} (ML). In the *aor.* the [attached *nom.*] *pron.* is not made prominent in ^{أَفْعَل} and ^{نَفْعَل} [165], because the two aoristic letters [404] notify the *ag.*, since ^{أَفْعَل} notifies that its *ag.* is ^{أَنَا}, and ^{نَفْعَل} that its *ag.* is ^{نَحْنُ}; and similarly, ^{يَفْعَل} being proper to the 3rd *pers. sing. masc.*, they do not need a prominent *pron.* for it; and, though ^{تَفْعَل} is common to the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* and 3rd *pers. sing. fem.*, still they do not make its *pron.* prominent, in order to treat the *sings.* of the *aor.* uniformly; and perhaps this is what induces Akh to say that the ^ي in ^{تَضَرَّبِينَ} is not a *pron.*, but a *p.* of femininization, and the *pron.* necessarily latent: while the predicament of the *imp.* ^{أَفْعَلْ} and *prohib.* ^{لَا تَفْعَلْ} is that of ^{تَفْعَلْ} for the 2nd *pers. sing. masc.*, because the *imp.* and *prohib.* are derived from the *aor.* [428, 419, 603]. The [attached] *nom. prons.* are not made prominent in the *eps.*, i. e. *act.* and *pass. parts.* and assimilate *ep.*, because, their requirement of the *ag.* not being radical, but due to resemblance to the *v.*, the *pron.* of the *ag.* does not appear in them, as likewise is the case with the verbal *ns.* and *advs.* [163, 165, 187]: and also because, the ^ا and ^و in the *du.* and *pls.* of *prim.* substantives, like ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} and ^{الزَّيْدُونَ}, being undoubtedly letters added as a sign of the *du.* and *pl.*,

and the *du.* and *pls.* of *eps.* being modelled upon the *du.* and *pls.* of *prims.*, the **ا** becomes a sign of the *du.*, and the **و** of the *pl.*, so that it is impossible for the **ا** and **و** of the *pron.* to be conjoined with the *du.* and *pl.*, lest two **ا** s and two **و** s be combined, and therefore the 2 *prons.* become covert, the **ا** in the *du.* and the **و** in the *pl.*, the proof that the expressed **ا** and **و** are not *prons.* being their convertibility [into **ي**] by the *ops.*, as ضَارِبِيْنَ and لَقِيْتُ ضَارِبِيْنَ, whereas the *ag.* is not altered by the *ops.* prefixed to its *op.*; while the **ي** likewise becomes covert in مَضْرُوبَاتُ and ضَارِبَاتُ in imitation of the *pron.* in the *pl. masc.*, since it is the *o. f.*; and, since the *pron.* is latent in the *du.* and *pl.*, it is *a fortiori* latent in their *sings.*; so that it is invariably latent in all [numbers and genders] (R). The detached *nom.* is (1) 1st *pers.*, (a) *sing.* اَنَا; (b) associated with or magnifying himself نَحْنُ: (2) 2nd *pers.*, (a) *sing., masc.* أَنْتَ and *fem.* أَنْتِ; (b) *du., masc. or fem.* أَنْتُمَا; (c) *pl., masc.* أَنْتُمْ and *fem.* أَنْتُنَّ: (3) 3rd *pers.*, (a) *sing., masc.* هُوَ and *fem.* هِيَ; (b) *du., masc. or fem.* هُمَا; (c) *pl., masc.* هُمْ and *fem.* هُنَّ (IA). According to the BB, اَنَا is a Hamza and نَ pronounced with Fath; and the **ا** is put after the **ي** in pause to make the Fatha plain, because, if it were not for the **ا**, the Fatha would drop off on account of the pause, so that it might be con-

founded with the *p.* ^أأى; and therefore it is written with the *l*, because orthography is based upon [the forms of] pause and inception: but sometimes its *و* is paused upon quiescent, or its Fatha is made plain in pause by the *ð* of silence [615]; and the *l* is retained in continuity also by the Banu Tamim as matter of choice, but by others only as a poetic license, as

أَنَا سَيْفُ الْعَشِيرَةِ فَأَعْرِفُونِي * ذَمِيدًا قَدْ تَذَرَيْتُ السَّنَامَا

[*I am the sword of the paternal kinsfolk; wherefore know ye me praiseworthy, having mounted upon the summit (Jsh)*]. The KK, however, hold that the *l* after the *و* is part of the word itself; but its mostly dropping off [in pronunciation] in continuity, with Fath and sometimes quiescence of the *و*, and the alternation of the *ð* of silence with it in pause are proofs that it is *aug.* and intended to make the vowel plain in pause. [The final of] ^أنَحْنِ is vocalized because of the 2 quiescents; and is pronounced with Damm, either because ^أنَحْنِ is a *nom. pron.*, or because it denotes the *pl.*, whose property is the *و*. The *pron.* in ^أأنتِ to ^أأنتِ, according to the BB, is ^أأى, its *o. f.* being ^أأنا, which, according to them, is a *pron.* applicable to all the 2nd *perss.* and to the 1st *pers. sing.*; so that they begin with the 1st *pers.*, and, though by analogy they ought to distinguish it by the *و* pronounced with Damm, as ^أأنتِ, still, since the 1st *pers.* is original, they make omission of the sign a

sign of it, and distinguish the 2nd *pers.* by a *p.* ت [560] after ان^{٨٤}, like the *n.* [ت] in letter and plasticity. But Fr holds that انت^{٨٤} in its entirety is a *n.*, the ت being part of the word itself : while some say that the *nom. pron.* is the plastic ت that is an attached *nom.*, and that, when they mean it to be detached, they support it with ان^{٨٤} in order that it may be independent, as some of the KK and IK hold that the plastic ك in اياك^{٨٤} is [an] attached [*acc.*], and that, when they mean it to be literally independent, in order that it may become detached, they make ايا^{٨٤} a support for it, so that the *pron.* is what follows ايا^{٨٤} [162]; and I think this saying to be not far from right in both cases. The و and ي in هو^{٨٤} and هي^{٨٤} are, according to the BB, an original part of the word ; and, according to the KK, an impletion, the *pron.* being the ه alone, on the evidence of the *du.* and *pl.*, where you elide them : but the 1st is right, because the letter of impletion is not vocalized, nor even authorized except as a poetic license. The و and ي are vocalized in order that the word, becoming independent by means of the Fatha, may be fit to be a detached *pron.*, since, if it were not for the vowel, they would be as it were impletions, as the KK think ; for, when you mean the word not to be independent, you make the و and ي quiescent, as انهو^{٨٤} and انهى^{٨٤} [converted, as will be shown,

into ^{أَنَّهُ}]: but the ^و and ^ي are sometimes elided by poetic license, as [^{وَأَكْفِيهِ} ^{أَلْحَ} (501),]

فَبَيْنَمَا يَشْرِي رَحْلَهُ قَالَ قَائِلٌ * لِمَنْ جَمَلٌ رِخْوٌ أَلِمْلَأُ نَجِيبٌ

*Then, while he was selling his camel-saddle, a sayer said,
Who has a he-camel soft in the side of the hump, well-
bred?* and ^{دَارُ} ^{أَلْحَ} [333]; and are made quiescent by

Kais and Asad; and doubled by Hamdān, ^{وَأَنَّ} ^{لِسَانِي} ^{أَلْحَ} [498]. The *du.* and *pl.* are lightened by elision of

the ^و and ^ي; and the addition of the ^م [in the *du.* and *pl. masc.*], the elision of the ^ي in the *pl. masc.*, and the addition of the two ^يs in the *pl. fem.*, are exactly according to what we mentioned in the attached [*nom.*].

These detached *nom. prons.* are common to the *pret.*, *aor.*, *imp.*, and *eps.*; and are not like the attached *noms*, none of which are common to the *pret.* and *aor.*, except

the ^{أَنَا}, ^{وَأَنَا}, and ^{أَنْتَ}: you say ^{مَا} ^{يَضْرِبُ}, ^{مَا} ^{ضَرَبَ} ^{أَلَّا} ^{هُوَ} ^{أَلَّا} ^{أَنَا}, and ^{أَضْرَبَ} ^{هُمَا}. They constitute for the 1st

pers. sing. of the attached *acc.* and *gen.* a ^ي either quiescent or pronounced with Fath [129]; and for the 1st *pers.* with others ^{أَنَا}, as in the attached *nom.*: and

for the 2nd *pers.* the ^{كَ}, like the ^ت in plasticity, as ^{كَ}, ^{كَ}, ^{كَمَا}, ^{كَمْ}, and ^{كُنْ}, while the elision of the ^و from [the *pl. masc.*, as] ^{وَعَلَيْكُمْ}, and the quiescence of

the *م* are as we described in ^{ضربتم} : and they abridge the two *sings.* of the 3rd *pers.* from the detached *nom.*, eliding the vowel of the *و* and *ي* from ^{هو} and ^{هي}, and converting the *ي* of ^{هي} into *ا*, so that it becomes ^{ها}; because, the *pron.* of the *masc.*, when it immediately follows Kasr, having its *و* converted into *ي*, as ^ي, they fear confusion of the *fem.* with the *masc.* The vowel of the *و* in the *sing. masc.* is Damma, unless it be preceded by a [quiescent] *ي* or a Kasra : and, if it be preceded by either of them, the people of AlHijāz preserve its Damma, saying ^{لديهو} and ^{بهو}; but others pronounce it with Kasr, because the *و*, being a light letter, is not an impassable barrier, so that the quiescent *و*, as it were immediately follows the Kasra or *ي*, and is therefore converted into *ي*, while the *و* is pronounced with Kasr on account of the *ي* after it : whereas, if the quiescent be any other than the *ي*, Damm of the *و* is agreed upon, except that, as F transmits, a people of Bakr Ibn Wā'il pronounce it with Kasr in the *sing. masc.*, *du.*, and two *pls.*, as ^{منه}, ^{منهما}, ^{منهم}, and ^{منهن} [below]. If the *و* of the *sing. masc.* immediately follow a mobile, its vowel is impleted, as ^{لهم}, ^{ضربهم}, ^{غلامهم}, and ^{يهم}, a *و* being engendered from the Damm, and a

ى from the Kasr: though the Banû 'Ukail and Kilāb allow elision of the *conj.*, i. e. the , and ى, after the mobile as matter of choice, with retention of the Damma or Kasra of the ى, as ^{و و و} غلامه and به, and also with quiescence of the ى; while others allow both, i. e. slurring and elision of the vowel, as a poetic license, not as matter of choice. But, if the ى of the *sing. masc.* immediately follow a quiescent, whether a soft letter, as in ^اعليه, or any other, as in ^امنه, the vowel is preferably slurred, i. e. the *conj.* is omitted, because, the ى being a faint letter, [if the *conj.* were put,] 2 quiescents would as it were run together; while Ibn Kathīr conjoins unrestrictedly, as ^اعليه, ^امنه, and the like. Thus in the ى of the *sing. masc.* after the Kasra or [quiescent] ى there are with respect to its Damm, Kasr, slurring, and conjunction 4 *dials.*, Kasr being the commonest, (1) Kasr of the ى, (a) not conjoined with a ى, [as به and ^اعليه,] which is more frequent after the ى than after the Kasra, because in the 1st case [if the ى were conjoined with a ى] there would be a quasi-concurrence of 2 quiescents; (b) conjoined with a ى, as به and ^اعليه, which is commoner after the Kasra than after the ى, because of what we have just mentioned:

(2) Damm of the δ , (a) with the γ , as ^{هـ}هـ and ^{عليه}عليه ;
 (b) without a γ , as ^{بـ}بـ and ^{عليه}عليه : while after the Kasra
 there is a 5th *dial.*, vid. making the Kasr of the δ to
 smack somewhat of Damma without conjunction. And,
 if a soft letter be elided before the δ of the *sing. masc.*,
 because of apocopation, as in ^{يرضه}يرضه XXXIX. 9. *He will*
approve it and ^{نصله}نصله IV. 115. *And We will burn him*,
 or pause [431], as in ^{قاله}قاله XXVII. 28. *And cast thou it*,
 the vowel of the δ may be impleted from regard to the
 mobile literally before it, or slurred from regard to the
 quiescent accidentally elided before it ; or the δ may be
 made quiescent by treating continuity like pause : with
 all of which pronunciations the Kur'an is read. The δ
 in the *du.* and 2 *pls.*, (1) if preceded by a Fatha or
 Damma, is pronounced with Damm, as ^{لهم}لهم and ^{غلامهم}غلامهم :
 (2) if preceded by an ا , γ , or sound quiescent, is like-
 wise so pronounced ; except in what F transmits [above],
 such as ^{منهم}منهم, ^{منهم}منهم, ^{اضربهم}اضربهم, and ^{اضربهم}اضربهم, because of
 the alliteration, and because the barrier is reckoned to
 be not impassable on account of its quiescence : (3) if
 preceded by a Kasra or [quiescent] ا , is pronounced
 (a) with Damm by those who say in the *sing.* ^{هو}هو and
^{عليه}عليه, vid. the people of Al-Hijāz, as ^{بغلامهم}بغلامهم and ^{بغلامهم}بغلامهم

and غَلامِيهِنَّ and غَلامِيهِنَّ and غَلامِيهِنَّ and غَلامِيهِنَّ

while Hamza makes Damm in the *pl. masc.* peculiar to 3 words, عَلَيْهِم, إِلَيْهِم, and لَدَيْهِم, because, as is said, the ي in them, being a *subst.* for the ا, is given the predicament of its *o. f.*; but, according to this reasoning, he ought to read in the *sing. masc.*, *du.*, and *pl. fem.* عَلَيْهِ, عَلَيْهَا, and عَلَيْهِنَّ, whereas he does not do so:

(b) with Kasr unrestrictedly by others than the people of AlHijāz, as in the *sing. masc.*, which is commoner. The م of the *pl.* after the 8 pronounced with Kasr, (1) if paused upon, must be made quiescent after elision of its *conj.*: (2) if not paused upon, then, (a) if followed by a quiescent, is more agreeably with analogy pronounced with Kasr, because of the alliteration to the Kasr of the 8 and because of the concurrence of 2 quiescents

[664], as مِنْ دَرَنِهِمْ امْرَأَتَيْنِ XXVIII. 23. *Below them*

two women and عَلَيْهِمُ الذِّلَّةُ II. 58. [*And*] *abjectness*

[*and poverty were made to cleave*] to them, according to the reading of Abū ‘Amr; while the rest of the Readers pronounce the م with Damm from regard to the *o. f.*:

(b) if followed by a mobile, is most commonly made quiescent, as I. 6. 7. [498]; while some implete the

Damm of the م, as عَلَيْهِمُ غَيْرُ الْمَنْصُوبِ عَلَيْهِمُ, like the reading of Ibn Kathīr; and impletion of the Kasr is more agreeable with analogy, because of the alliteration.

Thus the μ after the δ pronounced with Kasr has 5 states, 2 before the quiescent, vid. Kasr and Damm, each with slurring, i. e. omission of the *conj.*; and 3 before the mobile, vid. quiescence, impletion of Damm, and impletion of Kasr. And the μ after the δ pronounced with Damm in accordance with the practice of the people of AlHijāz in ^{ا.و}بهم and ^{ا.و ا.و ا.و}عليهم, and with common consent in such as ^{ا.و ا.و}لهم, ^{ا.و ا.و ا.و}غلامهم, and ^{ا.و ا.و}تفاهم, and with the commonest usage in ^{ا.و ا}منهم—as likewise [the μ of the *pl.*] in ^{ا.و ا.و}انتم, ^{ا.و ا.و ا.و}ضربتكم [above], and ^{ا.و ا.و ا.و}غلامكم—has also 5 states, 2 before the quiescent, vid. Damm, which is more agreeable with analogy and commoner, because of the alliteration and from regard for the *o. f.*; and Kasr, from regard to the 2 quiescents, which is extremely rare, and is disallowed by F : and 3 before the mobile, vid. quiescence, which is the commonest; Damm and conjunction with a و; and Kasr and conjunction with a ي, which is peculiar to the μ whose δ is preceded by a Kasra or [quiescent] ي, as ^{ا.و}يحيى and ^{ا.و ا.و}عليه, the μ being pronounced with Kasr for homogeneity with the Kasra or ي before the δ , and the و converted into ي on account of the Kasra of the μ , which also is disallowed by F (R). The detached *acc.*

is (1) 1st *pers.*, (a) *sing.* أَيَايَ ; (b) associated with or magnifying himself أَيَانَا : (2) 2nd *pers.*, (a) *sing.*, *masc.* أَيَاكَ and *fem.* أَيَاكِ ; (b) *du.*, *masc.* or *fem.* أَيَاكُمَا ; (c) *pl.*, *masc.* أَيَاكُمْ and *fem.* أَيَاكُنَّ : (3) 3rd *pers.*, (a) *sing.*, *masc.* أَيَا and *fem.* أَيَاهَا ; (b) *du.*, *masc.* or *fem.* أَيَاهُمَا ; (c) *pl.*, *masc.* أَيَاهُمْ and *fem.* أَيَاهُنَّ (IA).

To constitute the detached *acc.* they put أَيَا followed by the form of the *pron.* of the attached *acc.* [162]. They make the *pron.* of the *gen.* accord with that of the *acc.*, because the *gen.* is [also] an *obj.*, but through a medium; and make it accord with the expression of the attached *acc.*, because the *gen.* must be attached: so that the *pron.* of the *gen.* is exactly like that of the attached *acc.*

(R). The ي, ك, and ؤ, when attached to the *v.* are *objs.*; and, when attached to the *n.*, are *post.* From the 1st [rule], however, are excepted such [phrases] as اَوَايَتَكَ زَيْدًا مَا صَنَعَ [560]: and from the 2nd two sorts, (1) one where these expressions have no [inflectional] place, as in تِلْكَ and ذَلِكَ [172], and أَيَايَ [162], أَيَاكَ, and أَيَا : (2) one where they are in the place of an *acc.*, as in (a) الضَّارِبُك and الضَّارِبَةُ [113], according to S; (b) their saying لَا أَعْلَمُ لِي بِأَلَاَمٍ قَفَا مِنْهُ وَلَا أَوْضَعُهُ I have no knowledge of a baser fellow as to back of the

head than him, nor of a viler as to it with Fath of the ع, the 8 being in the position of an acc., like the 8 in الضاربة, except that the latter [8 (DM)] is an obj., and the former assimilated to the obj., because the n. of superiority does not govern the obj. in the acc., and not being post., otherwise أَوْضَع would be put into the gen. with Kasra [17]; (c) the saying [of AlAhwas (Jsh)]

لَيْسَ كَانَ النِّكَاحُ أَحْلَلَ شَيْئًا. * فَإِنَّ نِكَاحَهَا مَطَرٌ حَرَامٌ

[Assuredly, if wedlock be such that it makes lawful a thing unlawful, verily Maṭar's wedding her is unlawful (Jsh)], in the version with مَطَرٌ in the gen., the pron. being in the acc. as an obj., and separating the pre. [inf. n. (DM)] and post. [ag. (DM)]. The ك in رَوَيْدَكَ زَيْدًا [Deal gently with Zaid [187, 188, 560], if you construe رَوَيْدٌ to be a verbal n., [i. q. أَهْل (DM),] is a p. of allocution, [زَيْدًا being an obj., and the ag. a latent pron. (DM)]; but, if you construe it to be an inf. n., [i. q. أَرَادَ and أَهْلًا, governed in the acc. by a suppressed v., i. e. رَوَيْدَكَ (DM),] is a post. n., [the inf. n. being pre. to its ag. (DM),] whose place is the nom., because it is an ag. (ML). In XXIII. 101. [598] God is addressed with the pl. for magnification, like

فَإِنْ شِئْتَ حَرَمْتُ النِّسَاءَ سِوَاكِمْ
وَإِنْ شِئْتَ لَمْ أَطْعَمْ نَفَاخًا وَلَا بَرْدًا

[by Al'Arjī, *And, if thou wish, I will forbid myself women, except you; and, if thou wish, I will not taste sweet cool water nor sleep*, a single woman being sometimes addressed with the *pl. masc.*, as a man says of his wife *فَعَلُوا كَذَا* from taking such extraordinary pains to conceal her that he does not even utter the *pron.* applicable to her, whence *فَقَالَ لِأَهْلِهِ أَمْكُثُوا* XX. 9. *And said to his wife, Bide ye here (N),*] and

أَلَا فَارْحَمُونِي يَا إِلَهَ مُحَمَّدٍ * فَإِنْ لَمْ أَكُنْ أَهْلًا فَانْتَ لَهُ أَهْلٌ

(K) Now, then, have Ye mercy upon me, O God of Muhammad: for, if I be not worthy of mercy, Thou art worthy of having it (Jsh), it being a way of the Arabs to say to a great man and august sovereign *انظروا في* Look ye into mine affair, because lords and kings say *نَحْنُ فَعَلْنَا* and *أَنَا أَمَرْنَا* (N). 'Akīl Ibn 'Ullafa alMurri says

وَلَسْتُ بِسَائِلٍ جَارَاتِ بَيْتِي * أَغْيَابُ رِجَالِكِ أَمْ شُهُودُ

And I am not one to ask the female neighbours of my tent, Are your husbands absent or present?, orig. رِجَالِكُنَّ; but

to, because of the [anomalous (K, B)] saying [transmitted by Khl (K, B)] *إِذَا بَلَغَ الرَّجُلُ السَّتِينَ فَإِيَّاهُ* [الشَّوَاب] *When the man reaches the age of sixty years, let him [60] beware of the young women*, which is weak, because the *prons.* are not *pre.* [112]. Zj and Sf say that *إِيَّاهُ* is an explicit *n. pre.* to the *prons.*, as though *إِيَّاهُ* were i. q. *نَفْسِكَ* *thyself*. Many of the KK say that *إِيَّاهُ*, *إِيَّاهُ*, and *إِيَّاهُ* in their entirety are *ns.*, which is weak, since there is no *n.*, explicit or pronominal, whose final is successively *ي*, *ك*, and *ه*. And some of the KK and IK among the BB say that the *prons.* are the suffixes to *إِيَّاهُ*; and that *إِيَّاهُ* is a support for them, by means of which they become detached [161] (R).

§ 163. The attached *pron.* being shorter (Jm), the detached [*pron., nom. or acc. (Jm),*] is not allowable, except on account of the impossibility of the attached through (1) precedence [of the *pron. (Jm)*] before its *op.*, as *إِيَّاهُ ضَرَبْتُ*; (2) separation for an object [not realized except by means of separation (Jm)], as *مَا ضَرَبْتُ إِلَّا أَنَا*, [where the object is particularization (Jm)]; while the saying {of AlFarazdak (J)}

بِالْبَاءِثِ الْوَارِثِ الْأَمْوَاتِ قَدْ ضَمَنْتِ
إِيَّاهُمُ الْأَرْضُ فِي دَهْرِ الدَّهَارِ

{*By the Raiser, the Inheritor of the dead, when the earth has inclosed them in the time of calamities!* (J)} is a poetic license (R)]: (3) suppression [of its *op.* (Jm)], as ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَيُّكُمُ وَالْأَشْرَ [60]: (4) the *op.*'s being (a) *id.*, as ^{زَيْدٌ} زَيْدٌ [24]; (b) a *p.*, when the *pron.* [governed by it (Jm)] is a *nom.*, as ^{مَا أَنْتَ قَائِمًا} مَا أَنْتَ قَائِمًا, [since the *nom. pron.* is not attached to the *p.* (Jm)]: (5) the *pron.*'s being the subject of an [*acc.* or *pass. part.* or assimilate (R)] *ep.* applied to a person [or thing (Jm)] other than the one that [the quality denoted by] it belongs to, as ^{هِيَ} هِيَ زَيْدٌ ضَارِبَتُهُ [26]

(III); but that is correct only if ^{هِيَ} هِيَ be an *ag.*, not a *corrob.* [below], otherwise it would be included in the case of separation for the object of corroboration (Jm). If the *nom.* or *acc. pron.* be governed by the *v.*, it must be attached to its *op.*, except (1) when it precedes its *op.*, being then only an *acc.*, as I. 4. [20]: (2) when the *op.* is suppressed, as ^{أَنْتَ ضَارِبَتُ} أَنْتَ ضَارِبَتُ ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَيُّكُمُ [62], ^{أَنْتَ ضَارِبَتُ} أَنْتَ ضَارِبَتُ [23, 591], and ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَيُّكُمُ said in reply to "Whom shall I beat?"

[45]; whereas ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَيُّكُمُ وَالْأَسَدُ [60] is a case of precedence of the *obj.* before its *op.*, [i. e. ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَيُّكُمُ ^{بَعْدَ} بَعْدَ ^{أَيُّكُمُ} أَسَدُ (R on cautioning)]: (3) when it is separated from its *op.* for an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, *vid.* when it is (a) an *appos.*, (a) a *corrob.*, as II. 33. [158]

and لَقَيْتُكَ أَيَاكَ ; (b) a subst., as لَقَيْتُ زَيْدًا أَيَاكَ after
 أَخْرُوكَ [154]; (c) coupled, as جَاوَنِي زَيْدٌ وَأَنْتَ : (b) after
 إِلَّا , as مَا ضَرَبْتُ إِلَّا أَيَاكَ and مَا ضَرَبَ إِلَّا أَنَا ; while
 وَمَا نُبَالِي إِذَا مَا كُنْتَ جَارَتُنَا * إِلَّا يُجَارِدُنَا الْآكِبُ دِيلُو
 [And we care not, when thou art our female neighbour, that
 not any one but thou should be neighbour to us (AAz)]
 is anomalous: (c) after the sense of [مَا and (AAz)] إِلَّا ,
 as

كَانَا يَوْمَ قَرَىٰ أَنَّمَا نَقْتُلُ أَيَانَا

[by Dhu-l-Iṣḥā' al-'Adwānī, *As though we on the day of
 Kurra were slaying only ourselves* (AAz): F says that the
 Arabs treat أَنَّمَا like the neg. and إِلَّا as respects detach-
 ment of the pron., as in the saying of AlFarazdaq

أَنَا الذَّائِدُ الْحَامِي الذَّمَّارُ وَأَنَّمَا
 يُدَافِعُ عَنْ أَحْسَائِهِمْ أَنَا أَوْ مِثْلِي

{I am the repeller, the protector of what ought to be pro-
 tected; and only I or my like defends their honors (Jsh)},
 like the saying {of 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib (AAz)}

قَدْ عَلِمْتُ سَلْمَىٰ وَجَارَتُهَا * مَا قَطَرَ الْفَارِسُ إِلَّا أَنَا

(ML on مَا) *Assuredly Salma and her female neighbours
 have known, not any one has speared and overthrown the*

horseman but I (AAz)] : (d) after ^{جَاؤُنِي} ^{أَمَّا} ^{أَنْتَ} , as ^{جَاؤُنِي} ^{أَمَّا} ^{أَنْتَ} ,
^{رَأَيْتَ} ^{أَمَّا} ^{أَيَّامٌ} ^{أَوْ} ^{عَمْرًا} ^{أَوْ} ^{زَيْدًا} and ^{رَأَيْتَ} ^{أَمَّا} ^{أَيَّامٌ} ^{أَوْ} ^{عَمْرًا} ^{أَوْ} ^{زَيْدًا} : (e) the 2nd of the two
obj.s. of ^{عَلِمْتُ} or ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} , when attachment of the *pron.*
 would lead to its being mistaken for the 1st *obj.*, as when
 you make the 2nd *obj.* in ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} and ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا}
 [432] an *enunc.* [179], in which case you say
He that I knew Zaid to be ^{الَّذِي} ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} ^{أَبُوكَ} *He that*
was thy father and ^{الَّذِي} ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} ^{عَمْرًا} *He that*
I gave to Zaid was 'Amr, not ^{الَّذِي} ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} ^{أَبُوكَ} *nor* ^{الَّذِي} ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} ^{عَمْرًا} *nor*
^{الَّذِي} ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{أَيَّامًا} ^{عَمْرًا} , because the 2nd *obj.* would be mistaken for
 the 1st ; whereas, if it would not be mistaken [for the 1st
obj.], attachment is better in the *cat.* of ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} , and
 detachment in that of ^{عَلِمْتُ} , as when you make the
 2nd *obj.* in ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{قَائِمًا} and ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{دِرْهَمًا} an
enunc., in which case ^{الَّذِي} ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{دِرْهَمًا} *What I*
gave to Zaid was a dirham is better than ^{الَّذِي} ^{أَعْطَيْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{قَائِمًا} *What I*
knew ^{الَّذِي} ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{قَائِمًا} *What I knew*
Zaid to be was standing than ^{الَّذِي} ^{عَلِمْتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{قَائِمًا} , because
 the 2nd *obj.* in the *o. f.* must be detached from its *op.*
 for the same reason as [the *pred.*] in ^{كُنْتُ} ^{أَيَّامًا} [164] :

If the *pron.* be governed by something else than the *v.*, then, (1) if it be a *nom.*, (a) when an *inch.*, *enunc.*, *pred.* of ^{أَنْ} &c., or *sub.* of ^{مَا}, it is only detached : (b) when governed in the *nom.* by the *act.* or *pass. part.*, assimilate *ep.*, verbal *n.*, *adv.*, or *prep.* and *gen.*, then, (a) if separated from its *op.* for an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, it must be detached, as ^{زَيْدٌ قَاتِمٌ} زَيْدٌ قَاتِمٌ ^{مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ فِي الدَّارِ} مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ فِي الدَّارِ, ^{هَيْهَاتَ زَيْدٌ وَأَنْتَ} هَيْهَاتَ زَيْدٌ وَأَنْتَ, ^{أَخُوهُ وَأَنْتَ} أَخُوهُ وَأَنْتَ ; and like it is the prominent *pron.* after the *ep.* applied to a [person or] thing other than the one that [the quality denoted by] it belongs to, since this *pron.* is a *corrob.* [above] of the *pron.* covert in the *ep.*, not its *ag.*, because you say ^{نَحْنُ الزَّيْدُونَ صَارِبُوهُمْ نَحْنُ} نَحْنُ الزَّيْدُونَ صَارِبُوهُمْ نَحْنُ and ^{الزَّيْدَانِ الْهِنْدَانِ ضَارِبَاهُمَا هُمَا} الزَّيْدَانِ الْهِنْدَانِ ضَارِبَاهُمَا هُمَا, whereas you know the weakness of ^{جَانِبِي رَجُلٌ قَاعِدُونَ غُلْمَانَهُ} [146]: (b) if governed in the *nom.* by the *ep.* or *adv.*, when the 2 latter together with the *nom.* are *props.*, vid. when they are supported upon the *interrog.* Hamza or *neg. p.*; as ^{مَا أَقَاتِمُ أَنْتُمَا} مَا أَقَاتِمُ أَنْتُمَا, ^{أَنَا الدَّارِ أَنْتُمَا} أَنَا الدَّارِ أَنْتُمَا, it must be detached to distinguish the case where it is one of the 2 terms of the *prop.* from the case where it is not so : (c) if neither separated from its *op.* nor governed in the *nom.* by the *ep.* or *adv.* supported upon what has just been mentioned, it must be attached, because the *act.* and *pass. parts.*,

assimilate *ep.*, verbal *n.*, *adv.*, and *prep.* and *gen.* supply the place of *vs.* without needing an adjunct; but this attached *pron.* is only covert [161, 165]: (c) when governed in the *nom.* by the *inf. n.*, it is only detached, even if it follow the *inf. n.* without separation, because the *inf. n.* is not renderable by the *v.* except with the adjunct ^أأَنْ, as ^أأَعْجَبْنِي الضَّرْبَ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا and ^أأَعْجَبْنِي ضَرْبَ أَنْتَ زَيْدًا : (2) if it be an *acc.*, then, (a) if the *op.* be such as must be detached from the *acc.* by constitution, like the Hijāzī ^أأَنَا, as ^أأَنَا زَيْدٌ أَيْكَ, or if they be separated because of an object not fulfilled except by means of separation, as ^أأَنَا ضَارِبٌ إِلَّا أَيْكَ, the *pron.* must be detached, as you see: (b) if neither be the case, then, (a) if the *op.* be a *p.*, the *pron.* must be attached to it, as ^أأَنْتَ قَائِمٌ and ^أأَنْتَ قَائِمٌ, because the *p.* is not independent [134]: (b) if the *op.* be a verbal *n.*, the *pron.* must be attached to it, because, though it is *orig.* independent as respects the quality of *n.*, not in need of an *acc.*, still, since its sense becomes that of the *v.*, it is like the *v.* in the necessity of attachment to it, as ^أأَنْتَ رَوِيْدَةٌ and ^أأَنْتَ رَوِيْدَةٌ; while detachment is allowable in the case of such verbal *ns.* as the ^أأَنْتَ is attached to, as ^أأَنْتَ رَوِيْدٌ أَيْلًا and ^أأَنْتَ رَوِيْدٌ أَيْلًا, only by assimilation to ^أأَنْتَ رَوِيْدٌ أَيْلًا [164], though the ^أأَنْتَ [187, 560] is not this ^أأَنْتَ : (c) if the *op.* be an *inf. n.*, then,

(*a*) if it be pronounced with Tanwīn, the *acc.* is not attached to it, because the Tanwīn indicative of the word's completeness is inconsistent with the attached *pron.* indicative of its incompleteness, and moreover the resemblance of the *inf. n.* to the *v.* is weak, so that you must say ^{أعجبني} ضرب ^{أياك} if you do not prefix; (*β*) if the *inf. n.* be synarthrous, the ordinary opinion is that the *pron.* should be detached after it, as ^{أعجبني} الضرب ^{أياك}, because ^{أل} alternates with the Tanwīn in making the word complete [84], while Akh allows ^{الضربك}, the *pron.* being an *acc.*: (*d*) if the *op.* be an *act.* or *pass. part.*, there is a dispute as to the attachment of the *acc. pron.* to them [113], whether they be pronounced with Tanwīn or not: [for, according to Akh and Hsh, the *pron.* after the anarthrous is in the position of the *acc.*, because it is an *obj.*, the Tanwīn and ^و being suppressed not because of the prothesis, but because of the inconsistency between them and the attached *pron.*; while Rm, Mb in one of his 2 sayings, and Z say that the *pron.* after the synarthrous, whether the latter be *sing.*, *du.*, or *pl.*, is in the *gen.* by prothesis (R on the *gens.*):] and, though its attachment to them is better than its attachment to the *inf. n.*, because they resemble the *v.* more than the *inf. n.* does, still detachment of the *acc. pron.* after them is better, as ^{أياك} ضارب ^{أياك} or ^{أياك} الضارب ^{أياك} and ^{أياك} معطى ^{أياك} or ^{أياك} المعطى ^{أياك}.

§ 164. When 2 *prons.* follow an *op.*, then, if the 2nd be an *appos.*, the 1st must be attached, and the 2nd detached, as II. 33. [158] and ^{أَيْتَكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ}, because the *appos.* is not one of the requisites of the *v.* [131], so that it should be attached to it and be like one of its parts. But, if the 2nd be not [an *appos.*], then, (1) if one of them be an attached *nom.*, it must precede the *acc.*, because the attached *nom.* becomes like part of the *v.*; while every *pron.* that follows that *nom.* must be attached, whether it be more *det.* [262] than that *nom.*, as ^{ضَرَبْتَنِي}, or not, as ^{ضَرَبْتِكَ}, because the 2nd is as it were attached to the *op.* itself, since the attached *nom.* is like part of its *op.*: (2) if the *v.* be followed by an attached *acc.* without a *nom.* before it, as ^{أَعْطَاكَنِي} ^{زَيْدٌ}, or after a *nom. pron.*, as ^{أَعْطَيْتِكَ}, the *pron.* following that *acc.*, (a) if less *det.* than it, must be attached according to S; while others allow attachment or detachment, as ^{أَعْطَاكَ} ^{زَيْدٌ} *Zaid gave thee it* or ^{أَعْطَاكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ}, and ^{أَعْطَيْتَكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ} *I gave thee it* or ^{أَعْطَيْتِكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ}, and similarly ^{خَلَّتَكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ} *I fancied thee to be him* or ^{خَلَّتَكَ} ^{أَيَّاكَ}: the reason of its attachment being that there is nothing derogatory to the 2nd in being appended to, and becoming by attachment part of, what is superior to, because more *det.* than it; and the reason of its detachment being that the 1st attached is a complement, whose attachment is not like that of the *nom.*:

while detachment in the *cat.* of ^سخَلَّتْ is better than in that of ^سأَعْطَيْتَ, because, the 1st *obj.* in the *cat.* of ^سأَعْطَيْتَ being an *ag.* as respects the sense [432], the 2nd is as it were attached to the *pron.* of the *ag.*; whereas, the 2 *objs.* of ^سخَلَّتْ still containing some tinge of the *inch.* and *enunc.* [440], whose property is detachment [163], and the 1st of them being necessarily attached because of its nearness to the *v.*, detachment is better in the 2nd for observance of the *o. f.*: (b) if more *det.*, must be detached according to S; though S quotes from the GG allowance of attachment also, as ^سأَعْطَاهُنِي and ^سأَعْطَاهُوكِ, and Mb approves the opinion of the GG: while here attachment of the 2nd has not been transmitted by hearsay, because the 2nd, being superior to, as being more *det.* than, the 1st, disdains to be appended to what is inferior to it; whereas those who allow that by analogy, not by hearsay, look to the bare fact that the 1st is attached: (c) if equal to the attached *acc.*, then, (a) if they be of the 3rd *pers.*, as ^سأَعْطَاهَا and ^سأَعْطَاهَا, is, as S says, allowably attached, but oftener detached: (b) if not, is allowed to be attached by Mb, who approves it by analogy to the 3rd *pers.*; but not by S: while here also detachment is better, because the 2nd disdains to be appended to, and become a supplement of, what is like it; whereas that is allowable in the 3rd *pers.*, because each *pron.* relates to something else than what the other relates to,

contrary to the *prons.* of the 2nd and 1st *pers.* All of this is when the 2 *prons.* follow the *v.*: but, when they follow the *n.*, (1) if the 1st be an attached *nom.*, which is only latent [161, 163, 165], as زَيْدٌ ضَارِبٌ, the 2nd may be attached, [as exemplified,] or detached, as زَيْدٌ ضَارِبٌ أَيَاكُ : (2) if the 1st be a *gen.*, the 2nd, (a) if an *acc.*, is in the same predicament as when they follow the *v.* and are both *accs.*, i. e., when less *det.* [than the 1st], it may be attached or detached, as فَلَا تَطْمَعُ الْخَ [503] and مُعْطِيكَ أَيَاكُ or مُنْعَكَ أَيَاكُ and مُعْطِيكَهَا or مُنْعَكَهَا, like مُعْطِيكَ أَيَاكُ or مُنْعَكَهَا, except that detachment in what follows the *gen.* is better than in what follows the *acc. pron.*, because the *v.* is more habituated to attachment of the *pron.* to it than the *inf. n.* and *act. part.*; and similarly, when the 2nd is more or equally *det.*, attachment is anomalous, as ضَرْبُهُوْكَ and ضَرْبُهُوْءَ, whence

وَقَدْ جَعَلْتُ نَفْسِي تَطْلِبُ اضْغَمَّةَ
لِضْغَمَاهَا يَقْرَعُ الْعِظْمَ نَابِهَا

[by Mughallis Ibn Lakīṭ alAsadī, *And my soul has begun to be resigned to a calamity, because of their experiencing one like it, whose canine tooth strikes the bone, i. e. extremely severe (AAz)*]: (b) if a *nom.*, must be detached, whether it be more *det.* than the *gen.* or equally or less

det., because the prominent attached *nom.* is attached only to the *v.* [161, 165], as ضَرْبُهُ هُوَ , ضَرْبُكَ أَنَا , and هُوَ : ضَرْبُكَ (3) the 1st is not an *acc.*, except according to the opinion of Hsh and Akh on such as ضَارِبُكَ [163], in which case the predicament of the *pron.* that follows it, according to them, is the same as that of the *pron.* that follows the *gen.* (R). The [pronominal (M, IA)] *pred.* of كَانَ , &c., [may be attached or detached: but (IA)] is preferably detached (M, IH, IA) according to S, as كُنْتُ أَيَا (IA), because it is *orig.* an *enunc.* [447], which must be detached [163] (AAz); and attached according to IM, as كُنْتُه (IA): the poet ['Umar Ibn Abi Rabī'a (R, AAz)] says

لَئِنْ كَانَ أَيَا لَقَدْ حَالَ بَعْدَنَا * عَنِ الْعَهْدِ وَالْإِنْسَانِ قَدْ يَتَغَيَّرُ

[Assuredly, if he be he, he has indeed changed, after quitting us, from the youthful state: and man does sometimes alter (AAz)], and [the same poet (AAz)] says

لَيْتَ هَذَا اللَّيْلُ شَهْرٌ * لَا نَرَى فِيهَا غَرِيبًا
لَيْسَ إِيَّايَ وَإِيَّا * بَ وَلَا نَخْشَى رَقِيبًا

[Would that this night were a month, wherein we saw not any one, except me and thee, nor feared a watcher! (AAz)]; but a poet [says تَنَفَّكَ النَّحْ (454), and Ibn Duraid (AAz)] says

عَدَدْتُ قَوْمِي كَعَدِيدِ الطَّيْسِ * اِنْ ذَهَبَ الْقَوْمُ الْكَرَامُ لَيْسِي

[I numbered my people like the number of the multitudinous sand, when the generous men other than I (170) were gone (AAz)], and an Arab said عَلَيْهِ رَجُلًا لَيْسَنِي Let him keep to a man that is not I [170, 199] (M, R), the reason of the attachment being that كُنْتَهُ is like ضَرْبَتَهُ [97].

§ 165. No *pron.* is latent except the [attached] *nom.*, because the *acc.* and *gen.* are complements, since they are *objs.*; whereas the *nom.* is an *ag.*, which is like part of the *v.*, so that in the *cat.* of the attached *prons.*, which are constituted for abridgment, they content themselves with expressing the *v.* The cause of its latency, where it is latent, has been mentioned [161]. The attached [*nom.*] *pron.* does not appear at all in the case of (1) the *pret.*, 3rd *pers. sing. masc.* and *fem.*; (2) the *aor.*, in اَفْعَلُ, نَفَعَلُ, يَقَعْلُ, and تَفَعْلُ 2nd *pers. sing. masc.* or 3rd *pers. sing. fem.*; (3) [the *imp.*] اَفْعَلُ; (4) all the *eps.*, verbal *ns.*, and *advs.* [161, 163]: nor does the *ag.*, explicit or pronominal, appear in the case of 5 of them, vid. اَفْعَلُ, نَفَعْلُ, تَفَعْلُ 2nd *pers. sing. masc.*, the *imp.* اَفْعَلُ, and the *imp.* verbal *n.* in the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*; while what appears in II, 33. [158] is a *corrob.* of the latent [*pron.*], not an *ag.*: but the explicit *ag.*

and the detached *pron.* appear in the case of (1) *فَعَلَ*, *فَعَلَتْ*, *يَفْعَلُ*, and *تَفْعَلُ* 3rd pers. sing. fem., as *ضَرَبَ* *مَا تَضْرِبُ إِلَّا* and *مَا تَضْرِبُ هُنْدُ*, *مَا ضَرَبْتَ إِلَّا هِيَ* and *زَيْدٌ هِيَ*; (2) the *sing. ep.*, as *أَقَاتِمُ الزَّيْدَانِ* [24] and *مَا قَاتِمٌ هُمَا*; (3) the *adv.* when supported, as *أَفَى الدَّارِ زَيْدٌ* and *هُمَا*; (4) the verbal *n.* when enunciatory, as *مَا فِي الدَّارِ هُوَ* and *هِيَ هَاهُنَا هُوَ* (R). The saying of the GG on II. 33. that the coupling is to the latent *pron.* is a mistake, and has been refuted by IM, who holds it to be a coupling of *props.*, orig. *وَلَيْسَكِي زَوْجَكِ* and (let) *thy wife (dwell)*, and likewise says that *لَا تَخْلِفُهُ نَحْنُ وَلَا* XX. 60. *That we shall not break, nor (shalt) thou (break)* is in full *لَا تَخْلِفُهُ أَنْتَ*, because [the coupled is in the predicament of the *ant.* (538), whereas] the *nom.* of the *imp. v.* is not an explicit *n.*, and the *nom.* of the *aor. v.* possessed of the *نَ* is nothing else than the *pron.* of the 1st pers.; while he allows *ذَوْرٌ* in

نَطْرِفُ مَا نَطْرِفُ ثُمَّ نَارِي * ذَوْرُ الْأَمْوَالِ مِنَّا وَالْعَدِيمُ
إِلَى حَفْرِ أَسَانِلِهِمْ جَوْفٌ * وَاعْلَاهُنَّ صَفَاحٌ مُقِيمٌ

[by AlBurj Ibn Mushir at-Tā'i, *We roam about so long as we roam about; then repair, the possessors of riches*

of us and the destitute (repair), to holes (i. e. graves) whose bottoms are wide, and whose top is a broad stone standing fast (Jsh)] to be ag. of a suppressed *v.* of the 3rd pers., i. e. ^{يَا وَيْ} ^{ذُرُ الْأُمُورِ}, or, with what follows it, a corrob. [of the pron. in ^{نَادِي} (DM)] upon the principle of ^{ضَرَبَ} ^{زَيْدَ الظَّهَرِ} ^{وَالْبَطْنِ} [154] (ML).

§ 166. The form of (IH) a detached *nom.* [*pron.* (M, R) agreeing with the *inch.* (IH) in number, gender, and person, as ^{أَنَا اللَّهُ} ^{أَنْتَى} XXVIII. 30. *Verily I am God* and ^{أَنَّهُ هُوَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ} XII. 99. *Verily He is the forgiving, the merciful*, but sometimes in the 3rd pers. after a 1st or 2nd, because the latter occupies the place of a *pre. n.*, as

وَكَاثِنٌ بِالْأَبَاعِلِ مِنْ صَدِيقٍ * يَرَانِي لَوْ أَصِبتْ هُوَ الْمَصَابِ

{by JarIr, *And how many a friend there is of mine in the wide pebbly watercourses, who would think (the affliction of) me, if I were afflicted, to be the great affliction!* (Jsh)}, i. e. ^{يَرَى} ^{مُصَابِي} ^{هُوَ الْمَصَابِ} (R),] intervenes between the *inch.* and [its (M)] *enunc.*, before and after [prefixion of (M, R)] the [*lit.* (M)] *ops.* [of the *inch.* and *enunc.*, vid. the *cat.* of ^{طَلَى}, the *cat.* of ^{أَنْ}, the Hijāzi مَا, and the *cat.* of ^{كَانَ} (R)], when the *enunc.* is *det.* or [similar thereto, like

(M)] ^{أَفْعَلُ}مِنْ كَذَا (M, IH), as ^{زَيْدٌ هُوَ الْمُنْطَلِقُ}Zaid is the departer, [XVIII. 37. (419), ^{وَلَا تُحَسِّبِ}الَّذِينَ III. 175. (443) *And do not thou account (the niggardliness of) them that are niggardly of what God hath vouchsafed them of His bounty to be better for them* (M), i. e. ^{بِخُلِ}الَّذِينَ (K, B), XII. 99., ^{مَا زَيْدٌ هُوَ الْمُنْطَلِقُ}Zaid is not the departer (R), VIII. 32. *If this be the truth* (M),] and ^{كُنْتَ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ}V. 117. *Thou wast the watcher over them* (M, R). It is named [by the BB (M, R)] *distinctive* (M, IH, IA), because, [say the moderns (R),] it distinguishes the [case where what follows it is an (R)] *enunc.* from the [case where it is an (R)] *ep.* (R, IA), since, when you say ^{زَيْدٌ الْمُنْطَلِقُ}, the hearer may imagine ^{الْمُنْطَلِقُ} to be an *ep.*, and therefore await the *enunc.*, so that you put the distinctive to specify that it is an *enunc.*, not an *ep.*; or because, say Khl and S, it distinguishes the *n.* before it from the one after it by indicating that the latter is not a supplement [140] of the former, but is its *enunc.* (R): and by the KK *support* (M, R), because it keeps what follows it from falling from the status of *enunc.*, as the support in the house keeps the roof from falling (R). The ل

of inception is prefixed to it (M, R, IA), as ^{أَنَّ هَذَا لَهُ} *III. 55. Verily this is the true story* (IA), like ^{أَنَّكَ لَأَنْتَ الْحَلِيمُ الرَّشِيدُ} *XI. 89. Verily thou art the mild, the director.* The *inch.* ought to be *det.*, because the distinctive imports *corroboration* [138], since ^{زَيْدٌ} *زيد* means *Zaid himself is the stander*; and the *enunc.* ought to be synarthrous, because, when it is so, it imports *restriction*, which, importing *corroboration*, is in keeping with the corroboration of the *inch.* by the distinctive: while the form of a detached *nom. pron.* agreeing with the *inch.* is put in order that it may be in the semblance of a 2nd *inch.* whose *enunc.* is what follows it, the *prop.* being the *enunc.* of the 1st *inch.*, so that by this means the synarthrous [*enunc.* after it] may be distinguishable from the *ep.*, because the *pron.* is not qualified [147]; but afterwards, since the object of putting the distinctive is to avert confusion of the *enunc.* after it with the *ep.*, and this is the sense of the *p.*, vid. to import a meaning in something else [497]; it becomes a *p.*, and is stripped of the quality of *n.*, so that it keeps to a fixed shape, vid. that of the *nom. pron.*, even if what follows it alter from the *nom.* to the *acc.*, because the *p.* is aplastic; though it retains one plasticity that it had when it was a *n.*, i. e. its variation in number, gender and person, because it is not *orig.* a *p.* Then, greater latitude being taken in the distinctive, it is introduced where the

enunc. is similar to the synarthrous, vid. the ^وأَفْعَل of superiority, which resembles the synarthrous in that its particularizer is a *p.*, vid. ^{أَ}مِنْ [355], united with it, as the particularizer of the synarthrous is a *p.* united with it, i. e. the ^{لَ} (R). The conditions of the *pron.* named distinctive and support are [thus] 6, (1) that what precedes it should be (a) an *inch.*, actually or *orig.*, as ^وأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ VII. 156. *Those shall be the prosperous,* ^وإِنَّا لَنَحْنُ الصَّافُونَ XXXVII. 165. *And verily we are the standers in ranks,* V. 117., LXXIII. 20. [440], and XVIII. 37.; but Akh allows it to occur between the *d. s.* and *s. s.*, holding ^وهَؤُلَاءِ بَنَاتِي هُنَّ أَطْهَرُ لَكُمْ XI. 80. *These are my daughters, purer for you,* [read by Ibn Marwān (K, DM), Sa'īd Ibn Jubair, AlḤasan alBaṣrī, and Zaid Ibn 'Alī (DM)] with ^وأَطْهَرُ in the *acc.*, to be an instance of it: (b) *det.*, as exemplified; but *kr.*, *Hsh.*, and such of the *KK* as follow them allow it to be *indet.*, attributing ^وأَنْ تَكُونَ أُمَّةٌ هِيَ أَرْبَى مِنْ أُمَّةٍ XVI. 94. *Because a people is more numerous and wealthy than a people to it:* (2) that what follows it should be (a) an *enunc.* actually or *orig.*: (b) *det.*, or like the *det.* in not receiving ^{أَلْ} ^{أَلْ}, as above in the case of ^وخَيْرًا LXXIII. 20. and ^وأَقْلَ XVIII. 73.; while the condition of the one like the

det. is that it should be a *n.*, as exemplified: but Jj coordinates the *aor.* with the *n.*, because of their mutual resemblance, holding ^{اِنَّهُ هُوَ يَبْدِي وَيُعِيدُ} LXXXV. 13.

Verily He produceth and reproduceth to be an instance of it; and is followed by AB, who allows the distinctive in ^{وَمَكَرَ اُولَئِكَ هُوَ يَبُورُ} XXXV. 11. *And the plotting of those shall prove vain*; and by IKhz, who says that there is no difference between *accidental* prevention of ^{اَل}, as in ^{اَفْعَلُ مِنْ}, [where the preventive of ^{اَل} is the ^{اَل} (DM),] and in the *pre.*, like ^{مِثْلُكَ}, [where the preventive is the prothesis (DM)], and *natural*, as in the

[*pret.* and (DM)] *aor. v.*; while Suh says on ^{اِنَّهُ هُوَ اَضْحَكَ وَاَبْكٰى وَاَنَّهُ هُوَ اَمَاتَ وَاحْيَا وَاَنَّهُ خَلَقَ الزَّوْجَيْنِ الذَّكَرَ وَالْاُنْثٰى} LIII. 44—46. *And that He hath made to laugh and made to weep, and that He hath killed and made alive, and that He hath created the two mates, the male and the female* that the distinctive *pron.* is put in the first 2 [verses], and not in the 3rd, because some of the heathen sometimes attribute these acts to others

than God, as Nimrod says ^{اَنَا اَحْيٰى وَاَمَيْتُ} II. 260.

I make alive and kill, whereas the 3rd has not been claimed by any of mankind; and the text ^{وَيَرٰى الَّذِيْنَ اَوْثَرُوْا الْعِلْمَ}

XXXIV. 6. ^{الَّذِيْ اَنْزَلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ هُوَ الْحَقُّ وَيَهْدِيْ}

And they that have been vouchsafed knowledge know

what hath been revealed to thee from thy Lord to be the truth and to guide aright is sometimes cited as evidence in favour of Jj's saying, ^{أَٔ}يُهدى being coupled to [the 2nd obj. (DM)] ^{أَٔ}الْحَقُّ occurring as *enunc.* after the distinctive: (3) that it itself should be (a) in the form of the *nom.*; (b) in agreement with what precedes it [in person, gender, and number (DM)]. Its import is (1) *lit.*, vid. notification from the very first that what follows it is an *enunc.*, not an *appos.*; (2) *id.*, vid. corroboration; (3) also *id.*, vid. particularization, [i. e. restriction of the predicament to the mentioned, and negation of it from all others (DM)]: and Z mentions all three in the exposition of ^{وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ} II. 4. And those shall be the prosperous, saying that its import is (1) indication that what follows it is an *enunc.*, not an *ep.*; (2) corroboration; (3) affirmation that the import of the attribute is predicable of the subject exclusively of others (ML). Some of the Arabs make it an *inch.*, and what follows it its *enunc.*; [and accordingly ^{وَمَا ظَلَمْنَاهُمْ وَلَكِن كَانُوا} وَمَا ظَلَمْنَاهُمْ وَلَكِن كَانُوا ^{هُمُ الظَّالِمُونَ} XLIII. 76. Nor have We wronged them; but (545) they were such that they were the wrong-doers and ^{أَنَا أَقَلُّ} XVIII. 37. to be such that I am less are read (M, R) with the *nom.* among others than the Seven (R)].

§ 167. The *prop.* is preceded by a *pron.* [of the 3rd pers. (IH) *sing.*, *masc.* or *fem.* (R),] named the

pron. of the ^{شأن} case [when masc. (Jm)] and ^{قصة} fact [when fem. (Jm)], but by the KK {the pron. of (R)} the unknown (M, R), because that case is unknown until the pron. is (R) expounded by the prop. {mentioned (Jm)} after it (IH), as CXII. 1. (160) (M)]. It is [according to the ops. (IH)] (1) attached, (a) prominent, [an acc., in the cats. of ^{ظن} and ^{ان} (R), as in ^{ظننته زيد} I thought the case to be this, Zaid was standing and قائم LXXII. 19. And that the case was this, when the servant of God stood (M)]; (b) latent (M, IH), a nom., in the cats. of ^{كان} and ^{كاد} (R), as in their saying ^{ليس خلق الله مثله} The case is not this, God has created his like and IX. 118. [460] (M): (2) detached (IH), when an *inch.* or a *sub.* of ^{ما} (R). It is [preferably (R)] fem. when the [expos. (R)] prop. contains a fem., as ^{فانها لا تعمى الابصار} XXII. 45. For verily the fact is this, the eyes are not blind, [^{اولم تكن لهم آية}] ^{ان يعلمه علماء بني اسرائيل} XXVI. 197. (M), so read by Ibn 'Amir (B), And was not the fact this, that the learned of the children of Israel should know it was a sign for them? (K,B), or they had a sign, that the learned &c? (K),] and ^{على انها تعفو الغ} [507] (M, R), provided that the fem. in the prop. be not a complement or like a complement, so that ^{انها كانت} or ^{انها بنيت غرقة}

القرآن معجزة [19, 447] is not preferable, because, the *pron.* being intended, important, ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~purpose~~ ^{purpose} with complements is not observed. This *pron.* may not be suppressed, from want of indication of it [1], since the *enunc.* is independent, not containing a connecting *pron.* [27] (R). Its suppression, when it is an *acc.*, [however, is allowable, because it becomes a quasi-complement through being governed in the *acc.*, and is besides indicated by the sentence, as اِنَّ مِنْ يَدْخُلِ النَّحْ (517) and اِنَّ مِنْ لَمْ اَنَّ (1), the indication here being that the annullers of the *inch.* are not prefixed to *cond.* words; but (R)] is weak, except with اِنَّ when contracted [525], in which case it is necessary (IH). The reading of XX. 66. [171] is said to be orig. اِنَّ هَٰذَا لَهَا سَاحِرَانِ [27], the [2nd] *inch.* [اِنَّ] being then suppressed, and the *pron.* of the case, as in اِنَّ مِنْ اَشَدِّ النَّاسِ النَّحْ [517] (Sh). This *pron.* is irregular in 5 ways:—(1) it necessarily relates to what follows it [160], since it may not be preceded by the *prop. expos.* of it, nor by any part thereof; and ISf errs in saying on

اَسْكِرَانُ كَانَ ابْنُ الْمَرْأَةِ اَنْ هَجَا تَمِيمًا بِجَوِّ الشَّامِ اَمْ مَتَسَاكِرُ

[by AlFarazdak, *What! drunk was Ibn AlMarāgha* (i.e. Jarīr) when he satirized Tamīm in the region of Syria, or shamming drunk? (Jsh)] that كَانَ contains

the *pron.* of the case, and ^{أَبْنِ الْمَرْأَةِ سَكْرَانِ} are *inch.* and *enunc.*, the *prop.* being *pred.* of ^{كَانَ}, whereas correctly ^{كَانَ} is *red.*: (2) its exponent is only a *prop.*; and no *pron.* shares with it in this, [since the exponent of every other *pron.* is a single term (DM)]: (3) it is not followed by an *appos.*, not being corroborated [135], nor coupled to [158], nor followed by a *subst.* [154]: (4) it is governed only by inchoation or one of its annullers: (5) it is invariably *sing.*, not being dualized or pluralized, even if it be expounded by 2 or more *stories* (ML). The BB hold that both terms of the *expos. prop.* must be expressed, because, it being *expos.*, its own 2 terms ought to be independent of exponent. The exponent, when the annullers of the *inch.* are not prefixed to the *pron.*, must be a nominal *prop.*, [as CXII. 1.]; but, when they are prefixed to it, may be verbal also, as XXII. 45. (R). The *prop.* occurring as *enunc.* or *pred.* to the *pron.* of the case must be enunciatory, whatever is transmitted to the contrary being paraphrased, except the *pred.* of the contracted ^{أَنْ}, which may be a precatory *prop.*, as in the reading of XXIV. 9. [34, 525] (ML).

§ 168. The *pron.* in ^{بِهِ رَجُلًا}, [498] is a vague *indet.* [262, 505], thrown out at hazard without aim at any particular person, and afterwards expounded [84, 160]; and like it in vagueness and exposition is the *pron.* in ^{نَعَمْ رَجُلًا} [84, 160, 469].

§ 169. When the *n.* occurring after **لَوْلَا** and **عَسَى** is a *pron.*, the general practice is to say **لَوْلَا أَنْتَ**, **لَوْلَا أَنَا**, **لَوْلَا أَنْتُمْ** **لَكِنَّا مُؤْمِنِينَ**, **عَسَيْتَ**, and **عَسَيْتِ**, as **لَوْلَاكَ**, **لَوْلَايَ**, and **عَسَانِي**, as

وَكَمْ مَوْطِنٍ لَوْلَايَ طَحَّتْ كَمَا هَوَى

بِاجْرَامَةٍ مِنْ قَلَّةٍ النَّيْقِ مَنَهَوَى

[by Yazīd Ibn AlḤakam, *And how many a place of combat, if I (had) not (been present with thee) wouldst thou have perished (in), as a faller falls with his limbs from the summit of the peak ! (J)*],

أَوْ مَتَّ بِكَفَيْهَا مِنْ الْهُودِجِ * لَوْلَاكَ هَذَا الْعَامَ لَمْ أَحْجِمِ

[by ‘Umar Ibn Abī Rabr’a, *She signed with her two hands from the litter, saying, If thou (hadst) not (been with me) this year, I should not have performed the pilgrimage (Jsh)*],

تَقُولُ بِنْتِي قَدْ أَتَىٰ إِنَاكَ * يَا ابْنَتَا عَلَّكَ أَوْ عَسَاكَ

[by Ru’ba Ibn Al’Ajjāj, *My daughter says, Thy time of departure has arrived. O my father, perhaps thou, or may-be thou, (wilt find sustenance) (Jsh)*], and

رَبِّ نَفْسٍ أَقُولُ لَهَا إِذَا مَا * تَنَازَعَنِي لَعَلِّي أَوْ عَسَانِي

[by 'Imrān Ibn Hittān, *And I have a soul, to which I say, whenever it opposes me, Perhaps I, or may-be I, (shall attain mine object) (AAz)*]; while authorities differ as to [the explanation of] that (M). S and the majority

say that لَوْ is a *prep.* [513], peculiar to the *pron.*, as

حَتَّى [501] and the كَى [509] are peculiar to the explicit

ns., and not depending upon any thing [498]; and that

the position of its *gen.* is that of a *nom.* by inchoation,

the *enunc.* being suppressed [29, 574]: while Akh says

that the *pron.* is an *inch.*, and لَوْ not a *prep.*, but that

they substitute the *gen. pron.* for the *nom.*, as they do

the converse, since they say مَا أَنَا كَأَنْتَ وَلَا أَنْتَ كَمَا أَنَا

I am not like thee, nor art thou like me [509]; whereas

substitution occurs only in the case of the detached

prons., [a refutation of Akh's saying (DM),] because of

their resemblance to explicit *ns.* in their independence.

On عَسَانِي [in some MSS عَسَانِي (170) (DM),] &c.

[459, 462], there are 3 opinions:—(1) S says that عَسَى

is treated like لَعَلَّ in governing the *sub.* in the *acc.* and

pred. in the *nom.* [516], as لَعَلَّ is treated like it in having

its *pred.* conjoined with لَنْ [536]: (2) Akh says that it

continues to govern like كَأَنَّ [459]; but that the *acc.*

pron. is borrowed in place of the *nom. pron.*: which is

مَا عَدَانِي or قَامُوا مَا خَلَانِي and عَسَانِي, or aplastic, as اَكْرَمَنِي, or حَاشَانِي if حَاشِي be held to be a *v.* [511]; (b) the verbal *n.*, as دَرَاكِنِي, تَرَاكِنِي, and عَلِيْكِنِي; (c) the *p.* [اِنَّ, &c. (516) DM)], as اَنْنِي : (2) when governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ and عَنْ : (3) when *post.* to لَدُنْ, قَدْ [187], or قَطًا : (4) in other cases anomalously, as بِجَلَّتِي i. q. حُسْبِي my *sufficiency* [187] and اَمْسَلَمْنِي النَّحْ [609] (ML). The ن of protection is introduced into the *v.* to protect it from the Kasr, because what precedes the ي of the 1st *pers.* must be pronounced with Kasr; whereas, since they debar the *v.* from the *gen.* [404], and the Kasr is the original sign of the *gen.* [16], they dislike that what is sometimes the sign of the *gen.* should be found in the *v.*: while its introduction in such as اَعْطَانِي and يُعْطِيْنِي is either for the sake of uniformity, or because the Kasr would be supplied upon the ا and ي, if it were not for the ن, as in عَصَايَ and قَاعِي; and its introduction with the ن of inflection, as اَضْرَبْنِي, the ن of corroboration, as يَضْرِبُونَنِي, and the attached *nom. prom.*, as يَضْرِبُونَنِي and ضَرْبَتَنِي, is allowable because the ن s of inflection and corroboration and the *prons.* mentioned are like part of the *v.* This ن is inseparable from (1) all the paradigms of the *pret.*: (2) the *aor.* [including the *imp.*], except the five paradigms

containing the و of inflection [405], whether the *aor.* [or *imp.*] contain the و of the *pron.* or the single or double و of corroboration, as يُضْرِبُنِي and

هَلْ تُبَلِّغُنِي دَارَهَا شَدْنِيَّةٌ * لَعْنَتْ بِمَكْرُومِ الشَّرَابِ مُصَرِّمٌ

[by 'Antara, *Will a Shadanī she-camel cursed with an udder debarred from milk, cut off, bring me to her dwelling?* (EM)], or not. The place of the و of protection may be supplied by the و of inflection, contrary to the و of the *pron.* and the two و s of corroboration, although combination of two likes is realized in the case of all, because, the و of inflection having no meaning, like the و of protection, each of them is for a *lit.* matter, contrary to the و of the *pron.* and the two و s of corroboration. This is according to the opinion of those who, like Jz, hold the elided to be the و of protection, because the heaviness comes from it, not from the و of inflection; whereas according to the saying of S, that the elided is the و of inflection, because it is exposed to elision in the *apoc.* and *subj.* and has no meaning, the cause of the non-elision of the و of the *pron.* and two و s of corroboration is obvious, since they are not exposed to elision and have a meaning. Elision of the و of protection with the و of the *pron.* occurs, however, by poetic license, as

تَرَاهُ كَالثَّغَامِ يُعَلِّمُكَ مِسْكَ * يَسُوءُ الْفَالِيَاتِ إِذَا فَلَيْنِي

[by 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib azZubaidī, *Thou seest it (the hair of the head) like wormwood steeped in musk, vexing*

the women rummaging for lice when they rummage me for lice, orig. فُلَيْنِنِي (Jsh)], where the elided may not be the ن of the *pron.*, since the *ag.* is not suppressed. Three methods are allowable with the ن of inflection, elision of one ن, incorporation of the ن of inflection into the ن of protection, and expression of both without incorporation; and VI. 80. [405] is read according to all three. Expression of the ن with لَيْسَ is better, as اِذْ ذَهَبَ لَيْسَى [164]; but لَيْسَى is allowable, as اِذْ ذَهَبَ اَلْغَيْرَى [164], by assimilation to اَلْغَيْرَى: and عَسَى occurs by assimilation to اَلْعَلَى; but عَسَانِي is more frequent (R). It is disputed whether the ن of protection be inseparable from the اَفْعَلْ of wonder or not, as مَا اَفْقَرْنِي اَلْغَيْرَى [477] or مَا اَفْقَرِي; but the correct opinion is that it is inseparable (IA). The ن may be affixed to verbal *ns.*, because they convey the sense of the *v.*; or omitted, because they are not *orig. vs.* [187]. The ن may be affixed to اَنْ, اِنْ, اَلْكَانِ, and اَلْكَانِ, because they resemble the *v.* [516]; or elided, because the affixion is due to the resemblance, and is not original, and because of the combination of likes, together with the frequency of usage (R). لَعَلَّ is correctly denuded of the ن, as XL. 38. [411]; and expression of the ن is rare, as

فَقُلْتُ اَعِيرَانِي الْقَدُومَ لَعَلَّنِي * اَخْطَا بِهَا قَبْرًا لَا يَبْيُضُ مَاجِدُ

[Then said I, Lend ye two to me the adze : perhaps I shall carve with it a scabbard for a glorious sword (J)].

The ى is not elided with لَيْتَ, except extraordinarily, as

كَمْ نِيَّةَ جَابِرٍ اِنْ قَالَ لَيْتَنِي * اَصَادِفُهُ وَافَقَدُ بَعْضُ مَالِي

[by Zaid AlKhail, Like the wish of Jābir, when he said, Would that I were to find him, and I would lose some of my property for the sake of slaying him (J)]; but is commonly expressed, as IV. 75. [411] (IA). Jz says that expression of the ى in the case of مَنْ, عَنْ, قَدْ, and قَطْ is better known; but according to S elision is a license not allowable except in poetry, as

اَيُّهَا السَّائِلُ عَنْهُمْ وَعَنِّي * لَسْتُ مِنْ قَيْسٍ وَلَا قَيْسٌ مِنِّي

[O thou asker about them and about me, I am not of Kais, nor is Kais of me (J)] and

قَدْنِي مِنْ نَصْرِ الْخُبَيْبَيْنِ قَدِي
لَيْسَ الْإِمَامُ بِالشَّحِيمِ الْمَلْحَدِ

[by Ḥumaid Ibn Mālik alArḡaṭ, My sufficiency is the help (ى being red.) of the two Khubaibs ('Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair, surnamed Abū Khubaib, and his son Khubaib), my sufficiency: the Imām (Khubaib Ibn 'Abd

Allāh) is not the unrighteous niggard (J)] : and the **ي** is affixed for preservation of the inseparable quiescence [of the final]. According to S and Zj, elision of the **ي** from **لَدُنِي** is not allowable, except by poetic license ; whereas, according to others, expression is preferable, but elision is not a poetic license, because it is authorized among the Seven, [**قَدْ بَلَغْتَ مِنْ لَدُنِّي عَذْرًا** XVIII. 75. *Thou hast obtained from me an excuse* being read **لَدُنِّي** (K, B) by Nāfi' (B)] ; but IH follows Jz, who says that you are allowed an option in the case of **لَدُنِي**, the reading inducing them to say so : and affixion of the **ي** to **لَدُنِي**, though it is not a *v.*, is for preservation of the inseparable quiescence of the **ي**. Elision is better than expression in the case of **بِجَلِّ**, because of the dislike to a quiescent **ل** before the **ي**, and from the difficulty of pronouncing it.

§ 170.A. The most particular of the *prons.* is the *pron.* of the 1st *pers.*, then that of the 2nd *pers.*, then that of the 3rd ; and in combination the more particular prevails, as **أَنْتَ قُلْتُمْ** or **أَنَا** and **أَنْتَ قُلْتُمْ** and **أَنْتَ قُلْتُمْ** (R).

THE DEMONSTRATIVES.

§. 171. The *dem.* is what indicates a denominate and demonstration of that denominate: you say, when demonstrating Zaid for example, هَذَا *This*, the word هَذَا indicating the person Zaid and demonstration of that person (Sh). The *dems.* are the *ns.* that the denominate is demonstrated by; and on that account they contain the sense of the *v.*, and therefore govern *ds s.* [75] (IY). Only a visible sensible [object], near or distant, is *orig.* demonstrated by the *dems.*: so that, if an invisible sensible [object] be demonstrated by them, as تِلْكَ الْجَنَّةُ XIX. 64. *That is the Paradise*, this is because it is made to be like the visible; and similarly if what is imperceptible by the senses be demonstrated by them, as VI. 102. [172] and XII. 37. [561] (R). The *dems.* are (1) *sing.*, (a) *masc.* هَذَا: (b) *fem.* هَذِهِ [or هِئِهِ, with slurring or impletion (R)], هَذِهِ [or هِئِهِ, with slurring or impletion (R)], هَذِهِ, [and sometimes هَذِهِ (R)]: (2) *du.*, (a) *masc.*, [in the *nom.* (M, Jm)] هَٰؤُلَاءِ, and [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (M, Jm)] هَٰؤُلَاءِ, [but in some *dials.* هَٰؤُلَاءِ, whence هَٰؤُلَاءِ لَسَّاحِرَانِ XX. 66. *Verily these two*

are two enchanters (174) (M)]; (b) *fem.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, Jm)] تَايَ, and [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY, Jm)] تَايَ, [تَا being the only *fem. dial. var.* dualized (M, Jm), because of the frequency of its occurrence (Jm)]:
 (3) *pl., masc. and fem.* أُولَءِ [or أُولَءِ, a heteromorphous *pl.*, the measure of which is فُعَال upon the measure of غُرَاب (IY)], pronounced with prolongation or abbreviation (M, IH), and in the latter case [generally] written with the ي (R, Jm); which is common to the rational and irrational, as

ذَمَّ الْمَنَازِلَ بَعْدَ مَنَزَلَةِ اللَّوِيِّ
 وَالْعِيشَ بَعْدَ أَوَّلِكَ الْإِيَّامِ

(M, R), by Jarīr (M, J), *Disparage thou* [664] *the halting-places after quitting the halting-place of Al Liwā, and life after the passing of those days* (J), where it is used for the irrational (IY, J), as in انْصَبَّ السَّمْعُ وَالْبَصَرُ
 XVII. 38. *Verily the ear and the eye and the heart, all of those are inquired about* (J), and similarly

يَا مَا أَمِيلُ غَزَلَانَا شَدَنَ لَنَا
 مِنْ هَوَايَاكَ الْضَالِّ وَالسَّامِرِ

(IY), by ‘Abd Allāh [Ibn ‘Umar (ID)] Ibn ‘Amr Ibn ‘Uthmān Ibn ‘Affān al‘Arjī, *O how graceful* [288] *are*

young gazelles whose horns have budded for us from among those herds of gazelles that graze amidst those little [293] wild lote trees and gum-acacia trees! (Jsh), though it is mostly used for the rational, and there is a version ^{أَقْوَام} *peoples* [in the former verse] (J); and, when pronounced with Kasr, sometimes has Tauwīn [608], in which case, the Tanwīn denoting *indeterminate-ness*, as in ^{صَدَ} [187, 198], while ^{أُولَئِكَ} is *det.*, its import is *distance*, in order that the persons demonstrated may be like the *indet.*, so that ^{أُولَئِكَ} is like ^{أُولَئِكَ} [173]; and sometimes has the 1st Hamza changed into *ḥ*, as ^{هَؤُلَاءِ}, or the last Hamza pronounced with Damm, as ^{أُولَئِكَ}; and sometimes has the Damma before the *l* impleted, as ^{أُولَئِكَ} upon the measure of ^{طُومَار}; whereas ^{هَؤُلَاءِ} upon the measure of ^{تَوْرَاب}, as

تَجَلَّدَ لَا يَقُلْ هَؤُلَاءِ هَذَا * بَكَى أَمَّا بَكَى اسْفًا وَغَيْظًا

*Bear up: let not these say, This man wept, when he wept, for grief and rage is not a dial. var., but a contraction of ^{هَؤُلَاءِ} [174] by elision of the *l* of ^{هَؤُلَاءِ} and conversion of the [1st] Hamza of ^{أُولَئِكَ} into *ḥ* (R). The *dem.* in II. 1. [599] is made *masc.*, though the demonstrated is a *fem.*, vid. the ^{سُورَةُ} *chapter*, because ^{الْكِتَابِ} is (1) its *enunc.*, in which case, ^{ذَلِكَ} having the same*

meaning and denominate as الْكِتَابُ, the gender of the former may be made to accord with that of the latter, as in مَنْ كَانَتْ أُمُّكَ [182, 449]: (2) its *ep.*, *That scripture*, in which case only الْكِتَابُ is plainly demonstrated by it, since by the *dem.* is demonstrated the [*n.* of] genus occurring as its *ep.*: you say هَذَا الْإِنْسَانُ فَعَلَ كَذَا or هَذَا الشَّخْصُ Hind, *that human being*, or *that person*, *did such a thing*, and [An Nābigha] adh Dhubyānī says

نَبِئْتُ نَعْمًا عَلَى الْهَجْرَانِ عَاتِبَةً
سَقِيًّا وَرَعِيًّا لَذَاكَ الْعَاتِبِ الرَّارِي

[*I have been told that Nu'm (the beloved) is blaming the desertion: God send down rain to, and keep, that blaming, upbraiding (person)! (N)*]. And عَوَانُ بَيْنَ [115] may be prefixed to ذَلِكَ in عَوَانُ بَيْنَ ذَلِكَ II. 63. *Middle-aged between those two* because ذَلِكَ is i. q. two things [172], since it occurs as a *dem.* of the فَارِضُ and بَكْرُ mentioned [149], being allowable as a *dem.* of two *fems.*, though it is *sing. masc.*, as being a paraphrase of مَا ذُكِرَ or مَا تَقَدَّمَ for the sake of abridgment. And the *pron.* is sometimes treated like the *dem.* in this respect: AU says, I said to Ru'ba about his saying فِيهَا خُطْرٌ أَلَمْ

[161] "If thou mean the ^{حُطُوطَا}, say ^{كَانَهَا}, and, if the ^{سَوَاد} and ^{بَلَق}, say ^{كَانَهُمَا}"; and he said, "I meant ^{كَانَ} ذَاكَ" (K). The *dems.* [except ^{ذَانِ} and ^{تَانِ} (Sh)] are *uninfl.* (IY, R, Sh), upon quiescence, like ^{ذَا} and ^{نِي}; Fath, like ^{تُمْ} [175], as ^{وَأَزَلَفْنَا تُمْ الْآخِرِينَ} XXVI. 64. And We made the others draw near there; Kasr, like ^{هَوْلًا}; and Damm, like ^{هَوْلًا}, which Ktb relates that some of the Arabs say (Sh): (1) according to most (R), because they imply the sense of the *p.* (IY, R), *vid. demonstration*: for, this being a meaning, like *interrogation*, a *p.* ought to be constituted to indicate it [159], because their custom current in the case of every meaning introduced into the sentence or into words after their formation is that a *p.* should be constituted to indicate it, like the [*ps.* of] *interrogation* in ^{هَلْ} ^{أَضَارَبَ} ^{زَيْدٌ} and ^{لَمْ} ^{أَضَارِبْ} ^{زَيْدٌ}, *negation* in ^{مَا} ^{ضَرَبَ} ^{عَمْرُو}, *wish, hope, beginning, ending, premonition, comparison, etc.*, for which ^{لَيْتَ}, ^{لَعَلَّ}, ^{مِنْ}, ^{إِلَى}, ^{هَآ}, the *ك*, etc, are constituted; or that what follows the course of the *p.* in needing something else should be constituted to denote it, like the inflection indicative of the various meanings, the *ي* of relation, and the alteration of the formation alone, as in ^{غُرْفَةً} and ^{غُرْفٌ} and ^{كُسْرَةً} and ^{كُسْرٌ}, or with the addition of a letter, as in the *dim.* and some broken

pls.: and, since *demonstration* is a meaning introduced into words like ^{هَذَا} الرَّجُلُ and ^{ذَلِكَ} الْفَرَسُ in ^{هَذَا} الرَّجُلُ *This man* and ^{ذَلِكَ} الْفَرَسُ *That horse*, and no *p.* has been constituted to indicate it, the *dems.* become like impliers of the sense of the *p.* (R): (2) as some say, because the *dem.* resembles the *pron.*: for you demonstrate by the former what is in your presence so long as it remains present, and; when it is absent, that *n.* quits it, whereas [explicit] *ns.* are so constituted as to be inseparable from their denominates; and, since this *n.* is separable from what it is constituted for, it becomes like the *pron.*, which, being used as a *n.* when an explicit *n.* precedes [160], and not having been a *n.* for it before that, is a *n.* for the denominate in one state, and not in another: so that, since the *pron.* must be *uninfl.* [161], the vague [262] must likewise be *uninfl.* (IY): (3) as is said, because the constitution of some *dems.*, as ^{ذَا}, ^{تَا}, ^{ذِي}, and ^{تِي}, is [*bil.*] like that of *ps.*; while the remainder, as ^{أُولَآءِ} and ^{أُولَآ}, are made to accord with them: (4) as is said, because they need the context that removes their vagueness, *vid.* either sensible demonstration or qualification [148], as ^{هَذَا} الرَّجُلُ *This man*, as the *p.* needs something else [497]. The majority say that the *du.* is *uninfl.*, because the cause of uninflectedness exists in it, as in the *sing.* and *pl.*; and that ^{ذَانِ} is a coined form, not constructed upon a *sing.*, ^{ذَانِ} being a form for the *nom.*, and ^{ذَيْنِ}

for the *acc.* and *gen.*: but some say that it is *infl.*, because its termination varies with the variation of the *ops.*, while the assertion that each of them is a fresh form is contrary to the apparent [case]. And the dispute on ^{الَّذِي} and ^{الَّذَانِ} [176] is the same as on ^{ذَا} and ^{ذَيْنِ} (R). The *dems.* ^{ذَا} and ^{تَانِ} and the conjuncts ^{الَّذَانِ} and ^{الَّتَانِ} are like the *du.*, i. e. are *infl.* with the ^ا in the *nom.* and with the ^ي preceded by *Fath* in the *acc.* and *gen.* [16], like ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} and ^{الرَّجُلَانِ} : but are not really *dus.*, because the only *dets.* that may be dualized are such as are susceptible of being made *indet.*, like ^{زَيْدٌ} and ^{عَمْرُو}, which, when held to be common and *indet.* [12], may be dualized, for which reason you say ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} and ^{العَمْرَانِ}, prefixing the *p.* of determination to them [13], whereas, if they retained the determination of the quality of proper name, the *p.* of determination might not be prefixed to them; while, ^{ذَا} and ^{الَّذِي} not being susceptible of being made *indet.*, because their determination is by means of demonstration and the *conj.*, which are inseparable from them, that proves ^{ذَا}, ^{الَّذَانِ}, and the like to be *quasi-du. ns.*, like ^{هُمَا} and ^{أَنْتُمَا}, not really *dus.*, for which reason ^{أَلْ} may not be prefixed to ^{ذَا}, as it may not be to ^{هُمَا} and ^{أَنْتُمَا} (Sh).

But ذَاكَ, تَانِ, اَللَّذَانِ, and اَلَّتَانِ [176] occur in the three cases; and to this is attributed XX. 66. [above] (R). These *ns.* are said to be vague [262] because you demonstrate by them everything that is in your presence; and sometimes there are several things in your presence, so that they confuse the person addressed, who does not know which of them you demonstrate; and therefore these *ns.*, being vague, are for that reason invariably explained by the *ep.* upon the occasion of confusion (IY).

§ 172. The *p.* [ك (IY, Sh, Jm)] of allocution [560] is affixed to them (M, IH, Sh), to give warning of the number and gender of the person addressed (Jm), as ذَاكَ, [ذَانِكَ or] ذَانِكَ with the ى single or double [173], whence ذَانِكَ بِرَهَانًا مِنْ رَبِّكَ XXVIII. 32. Then those two shall be two proofs from thy Lord, ذَانِكَ, تَانِ, تَيْنِكَ, [but not (IY)] ذَانِكَ [below], اُولَئِكَ, اُولَئِكَ, and اُولَئِكَ (M). The ك is not a *pron.*, as in غُلَامِكَ, because that would necessarily involve its being governed in the *gen.* by prothesis, which is not allowable, because the *dems.* are not *pre.*, since they are invariably *det.* [112] (Sh). The ك of ذَانِكَ [173] does not indicate the 2nd *pers.* [160], but only allocution; so that it is a *p.* indicating a meaning, but

having absolutely no indication of the person (Sh on the *prons.*). It varies with the gender and number of the person addressed, as ^{كُذِّبَ} كَذَلِكَ قَالَ رَبُّكَ XIX. 10. *Thus hath thy Lord said*, [XIX. 21. (561) (IY),] XII. 37. [561], ^{اَللّٰهُ رَبُّكُمْ} ذَلِكُمْ VI. 102. *That is God your Lord*, and XII. 32. [502] (M). These [*ps.* of allocution (Jm)] being five [multiplied (Jm)] into five [sorts of *dem.*, i. e. the *sing. masc.* and *fem.*, the *du. masc.* and *fem.*, and the common *pl.* (Jm)], that [product (Jm)] is 25, vid. ذَانِكُنَّ [and ذَيْنِكْ (Jm)] to ذَانِكْ, ذَانِكُنَّ to ذَاكَ [and ذَيْنِكُنَّ (Jm)], and similarly the rest (IH), i. e. نَاكَ and تَانِكُنَّ to تَيْنِكْ and تَانِكْ, تَيْنِكُنَّ to تِيكَ and تَانِكُنَّ to تِيكَ ; ^{اُولَئِكَ} اُولَئِكَ and ^{اُولَئِكَ} اُولَئِكَ to اُولَئِكَ and اُولَئِكَ ; while ذِيكَ, though given by Z [above] and MK, is said in the [Th and] Siḥāḥ to be wrong (Jm). But there is another *dial.*, transmitted by trustworthy authorities, which makes the sign of allocution *sing.* and pronounces it with Fath in every case, by giving predominance to the side of the *sing. masc.*, as ^{اُمَّةٌ وَسُطَا} وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ اُمَّةً وَسُطَا II. 137. *And thus have We made you a chosen people*, where the analogy of the 1st *dial.* requires ^{اُولَئِكَ} وَكَذَلِكَ, because the address is to a multitude, as in the other text ^{لَنْ تَتَّبِعُونَا} لَنْ تَتَّبِعُونَا XLVIII. 15. *Ye shall not follow*

us. Thus hath God said before ; and hence ^{يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا} ^{أَن تَنْصُرُوا اللَّهَ يَنْصُرَكُمْ}..... ^{ذَلِكَ} ^{بِأَنَّهُمْ} XLVII. 8-10.

O ye that have believed, if ye help God, He will help you.....That is because they, not ^{ذَلِكَ}, though the addressed is a multitude (IY). And [thus] ^{ذَلِكَ} is some-

times used in place of ^{ذَلِكَ}, as ^{ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ خَشِيَ الْعَنَتَ} ^{مِنْكُمْ} IV. 30. That marrying of the handmaidens is for

him of you that dreadeth falling into fornication and ^{ذَلِكَ أَدْنَىٰ أَن لَا تَعُولُوا} IV. 3. That choice of one wife

will be nearer to the condition that ye be not unfair ; just as the sing. is sometimes used to demonstrate two [things], as II. 63. [171], or more, as ^{كُلُّ ذَلِكَ كَانَ سَيِّئُهُ}

^{عِنْدَ رَبِّكَ} ^{مَكْرُوهًا} XVII. 40. All of those, the evil thereof, are hateful in the sight of thy Lord, by paraphrasing the du. or pl. by ^{الْمَذْكُورَ} (R).

§ 173. The ل [599, 681] before the ك is optional, as ^{ذَاكَ} or ^{ذَلِكَ} (Sh). ^{ذَلِكَ} is ^{ذَاكَ} with the ل added in it [to indicate the distance of the demonstrated, and pronounced with Kasr because of the concurrence of two quiescents (IY)]. A distinction being made between ^{ذَا}, ^{ذَاكَ}, and ^{ذَلِكَ} (M), ^{ذَا} is said to denote the near, ^{ذَاكَ} the intermediate, and ^{ذَلِكَ} the distant. [But some,

holding that there is no medium between the *near* and *distant*, say that the *dems.* denuded of the **ل** and **ك** denote the *near*; and that those conjoined with them, or with the **ك** alone, denote the *distant* (R).] And like [the *masc.* (IY)] ذَلِكْ [in importing *distance* (171)] and [the *fem.* (M, R)] تِلْكَ (M, III) from تَلِي, in which they elide the **ي** because of its quiescence and the quiescence of the **ل** after it (IY), تِلْكَ, تِلْكَ with Fath of the **ت** by elision of the **ل** of **تَلِي** (R), and تِلْكَ [from **تَلِي**, in which they do not elide the **ل**, as they do not elide it in ذَلِكْ (IY)], the last [3 (R)] being rare (M, R); the *du.* (R) ذَانِكَ and تَانِكَ; and [the *pl.* (R)] اُولَئِكَ (IH) and اُولَآءِ [171] (R). The reduplication of the **ن** [in ذَانِي and هَذَانِي is a compensation for an elided letter, the **ل** of ذَا; but (IY)] in ذَانِكَ [and تَانِكَ (R)], says Mb, is a compensation for the **ل** in ذَلِكْ (IY, R) and تِلْكَ (R): so that, when you say ذَاكَ in the *sing.*, you say ذَانِكَ in the *du.* (IY); while, according to Mb, ذَانِكَ is the *du.* of ذَلِكْ (M). But others than Mb say that the reduplication is a compensation for the elided **ل** of the *sing.* [ذَاكَ and تِلْكَ]:

and this is more likely, because they say **الَّذَانِ** and **الَّتَانِ** with the **ن** doubled as a compensation for the elided **ي** [176]; while, if the reduplication were a compensation for the **ل**, **هَذَانِ** with **هَ** [174] would not be said, as **هَٰذِلِكَ** is not said: so that, according to others than Mb and his followers, the *distant* and *intermediate* have one expression in the *du.* (R). The **ل** must be omitted in (1) the *dem.* of the *du.*, as **ذَانِكَ** and **تَانِكَ**: (2) the *dem.* of the *pl.* in the *dial.* of those who prolong it, as **أُولَٰئِكَ**; whereas, if you abbreviate, you say **أُولَٰكْ** or **أُولَٰك**: (3) every *dem.* preceded by the premonitory *p.*, as **هَٰذَاكَ** [174], **هَٰتَاكَ**, and **هَٰتَيْكَ** (Sh). And Fr asserts that omission of the **ل** in all is the *dial.* of Tamīm, who content themselves with the **ك** alone to denote the *distant* and *intermediate* (R).

§ 174. The premonitory [*p.* (IH) **هَ** (M, R)] is prefixed to them [552] (M, IH). One says [*sing. masc.* (Sh)] **هَٰذَا**, [the **ا** of **هَ** being dropped in writing from frequency of usage, but retained in pronunciation (IY); *fem.* (Sh) **هَٰذِهِ** (IY, Sh), **هَٰتِهِ** (IY), **هَٰذِي** (M),] **هَٰتَا**, and **هَٰتِي**, [as

وَحَبِرتُمَا لِي أَنَا الْمَوْتُ بِالْقَرْيِ
فَكَيْفَ وَهَاتِي هَضْبَةً وَكَثِيبٌ

[by Ka'b alGhanawī, *And ye two told me that death was only in the towns: then how (did my brother die in this place), when this is a rock and a sand-heap?*

(N), } and وَلَيْسَ لِعَيْشِنَا آخٌ (149) (IY): *du.* (IY, Sh)

masc., in the *nom.* (Sh)] هَذَانِ, [and in the *acc.* and

gen. هَذَيْنِ; *fem.*, in the *nom.* (Sh) هَاتَانِ, {and in the

acc. and *gen.* هَاتَيْنِ (Sh)}: *pl.* (IY, Sh), *masc.* and *fem.*

(Sh)] هُوَلَا (M, Sh) or هُوَلَا (M), with prolongation [in

the *dial.* of the Hijāzīs, which is transmitted in the

Kur'ān (Sh),] or abbreviation (IY, Sh) in the *dial.* of the

Banū Tamīm (Sh), and هُوَلَا [or هُوَلَا] with elision

of the *l* of هَا, as تَجَلَدَ لَا يَقْلُ هُوَلَا آخٌ [171] and

هُوَلَا ثُمَّ هُوَلَاكَ اَعْطِيَتْ نَعَالًا مَحْذُورَةً بِنَعَالٍ

by AlA'shā, *To these, then those, did I give sandals measured by sandals* (IY). And [sometimes the *p.* of

allocution is with them, as (IY)] هَذَاكَ, [(IY),] هَاتَاكَ,

[and هُوَلَاكَ or هُوَلَاكَ, هَاتَاكَ, هَذَاكَ (M), هَاتِيكَ

(IY). The هَا is not part of the *dem.*, but only a *p.* put to

call the attention of the person addressed to the demons-

trated, as is proved by its ellipse, allowably in ذَا and

ذَٰلِكَ, and necessarily in ذَٰلِكَ [173] (Sh). One explanation of XX. 66. [16, 171] is that, when هَٰذَا is dualized, two ʾs, the ʾ of هَٰذَا and the ʾ of dualization, are combined, so that one of them must be elided, because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and therefore those who assume the elided to be the ʾ of هَٰذَا, and the remaining one to be the ʾ of dualization, convert the latter into ي in the *acc.* and *gen.* [16]; but those who assume the converse do not alter the ʾ [171] (Sh on inflection).

§ 175. And hence their saying, when they demonstrate the *near place*, هَٰذَا; and, when the *distant*, هُنَا, for which [هَٰنَا, with (IY)] Kasr [of the ʾ, a vicious and rare *dial. var.* (IY),] has been transmitted, and ثُمَّ (M): these *ns.* also being *dems.*, like هَٰذَا and هَٰؤُلَاءِ, except that by these *ns.* only that *place* which is present, and by those *everything*, is demonstrated. And Dhu-r Kumma says

هَٰنَا وَهَٰنَا وَمِنْ هَٰنَا لَهِنَّ بِهَا * ذَاتَ الشَّعَائِلِ وَالْإِيمَانِ هَيْنُومِ

[There (an *adv.* to زَجَلٌ in the preceding saying لِلْجِنِّ

بِالشَّيْلِ فِي أَرْجَائِنَا زَجَلٌ The Jinn have at night on our

sides a clamouring), and there, and here (مِنْ being *red.*)

or there: they (the Jinn) have on them (the sides), on the

left hands and on the right hands a muttering, with Fath of the δ in all three, or, as is said, with Fath of the δ in the 1st, Kasr in the 2nd, and Damm in the 3rd, and (FA)] with reduplication [of the ن in all three (FA)]; but, as for the saying of the Rājiz

قَدْ وَدِدْتُ مِنْ أَمَكْنَةٍ
مِنْ هَاهُنَا وَمِنْ هُنَا
إِنْ لَمْ أَرَوْهَا فَمَهْ

[They (the camels) have come to water from many places, from here and from here: if I quench not their thirst, what (am I to do)? (AAz)], he means هُنَا, and substitutes a δ for the ه [181, 690] (IY). هُنَا is invariably an *adv.*, either in the *acc.* or governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ or إِلَى only (R). ثُمَّ is a *n.* whereby distant place is demonstrated, as XXVI. 64. [171]: and it [also] is an *aplastic* [64] *adv.* [of place, i. e. is not used except as an *adv.*, nor governed in the *gen.* except by مِنْ (DM)]; for which reason he that parses it as [direct (DM)] *obj.* of رَأَيْتَ in رَأَيْتَ ثُمَّ رَأَيْتَ in LXXVI. 20. And, when thou seest there, thou shalt see makes a blunder, [رَأَيْتَ having no *obj.* expressed or supplied, in order that it may be general, and ثُمَّ being in the position of the *acc.* as an *adv.*, i. e. in Paradise (K)]: and it is not preceded by the premonitory *p.* [552],

nor followed by the ك of allocution [560] (ML). The ك [of allocution (M)] is affixed, [and the premonitory p. is prefixed (M),] to [هنا and (M)] ههنا (M, R), as ههناك, ههنا, and ههنا, e. g. انا ههنا قاعدون V. 27. *Verily we stop here* (IY); but not to ثم, the saying ثمك being wrong (R): and [they put the ل, so that (IY)] هنالك [599, 681] is said, as ذاك [173] is said (M), e. g. XVIII. 42. [75] (IY). ههنا denotes the *near*, ههناك the *intermediate*, and هنالك the *distant*: while ههنا, ههنا, and ههنا, like هنالك, denote the *distant*. But sometimes *time* is meant by ههناك, ههناك, and ههنا, as XVIII. 42. [75], i. e. حينئذ *Then*, and حنت ههنا, [109], i. e. ولات حين حنت *when (the longing was) not at a time that etc*, ههنا being an *adv. of time*, because of its prefixion to the *prop.* [124] (R). IHsh, however, says that the *dem.* is not *pre.* (SM); and the best is the saying of F that لات is *inop.*, [the *adv.*] ههنا a *prepos. enunc.*, and حنت a *postpos. incl.* by subaudition of اى, as in [ومن آياته يريكم البرق] XXX. 23. *And among His signs is (that) He showeth you the lightning* and (SM) [تسمع بالمعیدی] [2, 418. A.] (ML), i. e. وليس كائنًا في هذا الوقت, i. e. الحنين ههنا (DM).

THE CONJUNCTS.

§. 176. They are (1) [*الَّذِي* and *الَّتِي* and their *du.* and *pl.* (IY),] (a) *sing., masc.* *الَّذِي*, [used for the rational and irrational (IY, Sh), as XXXIX. 34. (178) and *وَوَاعَدُوكُمْ قُرْبَىٰ يَوْمِكُمْ الَّذِي كُنْتُمْ تُوعَدُونَ* XXI. 103. *This is your day, which ye used to be promised* (Sh)]; *fem.* *الَّتِي*, [used for the rational and irrational, as LVIII. 1. (575) and *سَيَقُولُ السُّفَهَاءُ مِنَ النَّاسِ مَا وَلَّاهُمْ عَنْ قِبَلَتِهِمُ الَّتِي* and *كَانُوا عَلَيْهَا* II. 136. *The foolish of the people continually* (578) *say, What hath turned them away from their Kibla that they were determined upon?* (Sh): (a) sometimes the *ي* of *الَّذِي* {and *الَّتِي* (IY, R, Sh)} is (α) doubled (M, R, Sh), as *الَّذِي* and *الَّتِي* (IY, R), the two words being then *infl.* {like *أَي* according to Jz, (R)}, or *uninfl.* upon Kasr (R, Sh) according to some, as

وَلَيْسَ الْمَالُ فَاعِلُهُ بِعَالٍ * وَإِنْ أَغْنَاكَ إِلَّا لِلَّذِي
يُنَالُ بِهِ الْعُلَا * وَيُصْطَفِيهِ * لِأَقْرَبِ اقْرَبِيَّةٍ وَلِلصَّفِيِّ

And wealth is not (then know thou it) wealth, even if it enrich thee, except for him that obtains by it eminence, and devotes it to the nearest of his kindred and to the friend (R); (β) elided, the preceding letter being then

pronounced with Kasr, {as it was before the elision (Sh),} or quiescent (IY, R, Sh), as

وَالَّذِي لَوْ شَاءَ لَكُنْتَ صَخْرًا * أَوْ جَبَلًا أَوْ مَشْمُخْرًا

By Him Who is such that, if He willed, I should be a rock or a mountain solid, high,

وَلَا تَكُونِي مِنَ الَّذِينَ كِيدُوا * كَالَّذِي تَزَىٰ زَبِيئَةً فَاَصْطِيدُ

And be sure thou be not of them that have been outwitted, like him that has dug a pitfall, and been caught in it himself, and

قُلْ لِّلَّاتُ تَلُوْمَكَ اِنَّ نَفْسِي * اَرَاهَا لَا تَعُوْنُ بِالْعَمِيْمِ

Then say thou to her that blames thee, Verily my soul, I know it charms not with amulets (R): (b) the ا and

ل in اَلَّذِي and اَلَّتِي and their *du.* and *pl.* are, according to critical judges, *red.* (599), what is intended by them being the form of determination, not its sense, as is proved by two matters, (α) that the ا and ل in the conjuncts are an inseparable addition; whereas the ل of determination is not known by us to occur inseparably, but on the contrary may be dropped, as اَلْغُلَامُ and

اَلْغُلَامُ; while we do not find them say اَلْنِ, as they say اَلْغُلَامُ; (β) that we find many of the conjunct *ns.* to be

denuded of the ا and ل, but, notwithstanding that, to be *det.*, *vid.* اَمِي, مَا, and اَيُّ, their determinateness being only by means of the *conjs.* after them; and, when

it is established that the *conj.* is determinative, the **ا** and **و** in such conjuncts as they are prefixed to are not determinative also, because the *n.* does not become *det.* for two different reasons: (c) the **ا** and **و** are added for a sort of rectification of the form, because **الَّذِي** and such of its sisters as contain a **و** are introduced only as connectives to the qualification of *dets.* by *props.* (178): for *props.* are *indet.* (144), and the *indet.* is not an *ep.* of the *det.* (146); while it is impossible to prefix the **و** of determination to the *prop.*, because this **و** is one of the peculiarities of *ns.* (2), whereas the *prop.* is not peculiar to *ns.*, but is nominal and verbal: so that they then put **الَّذِي**, and make the *prop.* a *conj.* to **الَّذِي**, which is the *ep.* in form, though the object is the *prop.*; and, the form of **الَّذِي** before the prefixion of the **ا** and **و** not being in accordance with the form of the *eps.* of *dets.*, they add at its beginning the **ا** and **و**, in order that they may thereby obtain the form of the *det.*, which they intend, and thus the form and sense may correspond (IY): (b) *du.*, *masc.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, IA, Sh)] **الَّذَانِ**, [and in the *acc.* and *gen.* **الَّذَيْنِ** (IY, IA, Sh)]; *fem.*, [in the *nom.* (IY, IA, Sh)] **الَّتَانِ**, [and in the *acc.* and *gen.* **الَّتَيْنِ** (IY, IA, Sh): the **ي** being elided in the *du.* (IY, R, IA); and replaced by the **ا** in the *nom.*, and by the **ي** in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IA)]: (a)

sometime the ذ is (α) doubled, [as a compensation for the elided ي (173) (R, IA), as in the reading {of Ibn Kathir (IY)} $\text{وَالَّذَانِ يَأْتِيَانِيَا مِنْكُمْ}$ IV. 20 *And the two of you that shall commit it* (IY, IA) and the reading $\text{رَبَّنَا اِزِنَا لِلَّذَيْنِ}$ XLI. 29. *Our Lord, show Thou us the two that*; and this reduplication is allowable in the *du.* of the *dems.* ذَا and تَا also, as ذَانِ , تَانِ , ذَيْنِ , and تَيْنِ , being intended as a compensation for the elided ا (IA): (β) elided (R, Sh), because the conjunct is deemed too long by reason of its *conj.*, as اِبْنِي كَلَيْبٍ (178) and

$\text{هُمَا اللَّتَا لَوْ وَلَدَتْ تَعِيمٌ * لَقِيلَ فَخَرَّ لَهُمْ صَمِيمٌ}$

{by AlAkhtal, *They two are those two women who are such that, if Tamim had given them birth, it would have been said, Theirs is genuine glory!* (Jsh)}: (b) the *dus.* are *infl.* or *uninfl.*, according to the different opinions on ذَانِ and تَانِ (171); and الَّذَانِ and الَّتَانِ occur in the three cases in some unchaste *dials.*; but, when they vary, it is better to say that they are *infl.* (R)]: (c) *pl., masc.* الَّذَيْنِ , [for the rational (R, IA), in the three cases (IY, R, IA, Sh)]; and [in some *dials.* (M)] الَّذَوْنِ [in the *nom.* (IY, R, IA, Sh), the *dial.* of Hudhail (R, IA), or, as some say, 'Ukail (J), whence

نَحْنُ الَّذِينَ صَبَحُوا الصَّبَاحَ * يَوْمَ النَّخِيلِ غَارَةً مُلْحَا

(IA), by Abū Harb AlA'lam alJāhili al'Ukāili, *We are they that came in the morning on the day of AnNukhail (a place in Syria) for an obstinate onslaught* (Jsh), الَّذِينَ being written with two ل s, and الَّذِينَ with one, because آل, being a determinative or in the semblance thereof, whereas the determinative is not prefixed to the p. nor to the *uninfls.* like it, is elided in writing, contrary to the *infl.* (DM), and الَّذِينَ in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY, IA), the inflection of the *pl.* being, says Z, the *dial.* of those who double the ي in the *sing.*, which confirms the saying of Jz that الَّذِي is *infl.*, so that الَّذِينَ is *orig.* الَّذِينَ, and, one of the two ي s having been elided, is afterwards treated like قَاضُونَ; while some transmit الَّذِينَ in the *nom.* and الَّذِينَ in the *acc.* and *gen.*, which is the *dial.* of those who double the ي, and then pluralize الَّذِي without elision of anything; and sometimes the ن is elided from الَّذِينَ for alleviation, as

قَرُمِ النَّوْرَ بَعَاظَ طَيْرُوا شَرًّا

مِنْ رُؤْسِ قَوْمِكَ ضَرْبًا بِالْمَتَاقِيلِ

My people are they that at 'Ukāz made sparks fly from the heads of thy people, smiting with the weights, and from الَّذِينَ also, as دَانِ الَّذِي حَانَتْ أَلْحُ (117, 178) (R)]; and الَّذِي [or لَا (FA), i. q. الَّذِينَ (IY, FA), a heteromorphous pl. of الَّذِي (IY, R), upon the measure of الْعَلَى (R), pronounced with abbreviation or prolongation (Sh), used for the rational and irrational, and sometimes for the pl. fem., both matters being combined in

وَتَبْلَى الْأَلَى يَسْتَلْمُونَ عَلَى الْأَلَى

تَرَاهُنَّ يَوْمَ الرُّوْعِ كَالْحِدَى الْقَبْلِ

(IA), by Abū Dhu'aib alHudhalī, *And it (relating to Fate in the preceding verse) consumes those heroes who put on coats of mail when purposing to mount upon those mares which thou wilt know on the day of battle to be like squint-eyed kites in swiftness (J); and اللَّائِيْنَ*

in the nom., acc., and gen.; and, the ن being elided, اللَّائِي, like الْقَاضِي, which is rare in the masc., as

لَلَّائِي يُؤْلُونَ مِنْ نِسَائِهِمْ II. 226. *For them that swear to abstain from their wives, so read by Akh (R); and اللَّائِي*

(R, IA), by elision of the ي (R), as

فَمَا أَبَاؤُنَا بِأَمْنٍ مَذَّة * عَلَيْنَا إِلَّا قَدْ مَهْدُوا الْحَجُّورَا

(IA) *Then our fathers, who have spread out the bosoms*
of their garments as cradles for us, *are not kinder to us*
than he (J); and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الْأَوْنَ in the *nom.*, and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الْأَتَيْنِ in the
acc. and *gen.* (M, R), *perf. pl.* of ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الْأَاءِ i. q. ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّذِي, as
^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (IY): *fem.* ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (IY): *fem.* ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي, i. e. ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّذِي فَعَلَ, i. e. ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّذِي فَعَلَ كَذَا
[upon the measure of ^{سَمَوَاتِ}فَاعِل from ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتِي, a *quasi-pl. n.*, like
^{سَمَوَاتِ}الْجَامِل and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الْبَاقِر (257) (R)]; and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي, [with Hamza
in place of the ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ت, which is frequent in the *pl.* of ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتِي,
but not in the *pl.* of ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّذِي (R); and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (M, R) and
^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (IY, R), as though they were *pls.* of the *pl.* (R)];
and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي, ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (IY, R), by elision
of the ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ي (R, IA, Sh) in all four (R), as in LXV. 4.
(29) (IY, Sh), which is read with or without the ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ي,
while ^{سَمَوَاتِ}وَالَّتَاتِي يَاتِينَ الْفَاحِشَةَ IV. 19. *And those who shall*
commit adultery is read among the Seven only with the
^{سَمَوَاتِ}ي, because it is lighter than ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي, as being without a
Hamza (Sh); and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي (M, R), the Hamza of ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي being
lightened between Hamza and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ي (658), because it is
pronounced with Kasr, as in the reading of Warsh
^{سَمَوَاتِ}وَالَّتَاتِي يَاتِينَ LXV. 4.; and ^{سَمَوَاتِ}الَّتَاتِي with a quiescent ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ي
after the ^{سَمَوَاتِ}ل without a Hamza, as in the reading of Abū
‘Amr and Bz (610), which, says Abū ‘Amr, is the *diāl*.

of Kuraish; and ^{اللَّوَا}, by elision of the ^ت and ^ي together; and ^{اللَّادَات}, like ^{اللَّاعَات}, having the ^ت pronounced with Kasr, or *infl.* like ^{المسلمات}; and ^{الآلِي}, a heteromorphous *pl.* of ^{الَّتِي} also, ^{الآلِي} and ^{الآئِي} being common to ^{الَّذِي} and ^{الَّتِي}, except that ^{الآلِي} is better known in the *pl.* of the *masc.*, while ^{الآئِي} is the reverse of it (R)]: (2) [common to all genders and numbers (R, IA, Sh),] (a) ^{أَل}, [denoting the rational and irrational (IA), prefixed to the *act.* and *pass. parts.* (R, Sh), as ^{الضَّارِبُ} and ^{الْمَضْرُوبُ} (177) (Sh), and held by Z to be a defective form of ^{الَّذِي}, etc. (178), but properly not the ^ل of ^{الَّذِي}, because the ^ل of ^{الَّذِي} is *red.*, contrary to the conjunct ^ل (R)]: (b) ^{مَا} [180]: (c) ^{مَنْ} [182]: (d) ^{أَي}, [*pre.* to a *det.* (116), in order that it may be *det.* (262) (R), as XIX. 70. (184) (Sh), the prefixion being either expressed or constructive: (a) ^{أَي}, when the *fem.* is meant by it, may have the ^ة affixed to it, whether it be conjunct, *interrog.*, or otherwise, as ^{لَقِيتُ أَيَّهَا لَقِيتُ} or ^{لَقِيتُ أَيَّهَا} *I met her of them that thou didst meet*; though An says that femininization is anomalous in it, as it is in ^{كَلَّمْتُهُ} {*fem.* of ^{كُلُّ} (K, B on XXXI. 34.)}, ^{خَيْرَةٌ}

شَرَّةُ النَّاسِ and النَّاسِ, (b) some of the Arabs dualize and pluralize it also, in interrogation and elsewhere, as أَيَاهُمْ ^{أَيَاهُمْ} *Which two of them are thy two brothers?* and أَيُوهُمْ ^{أَيُوهُمْ} *Which of them are thy brothers?*; which are more anomalous than the femininization, but are made allowable by its plasticity in inflection (R)]: (e) the Tā'ī ^{تَايِي}, [denoting the rational and irrational (IA), as لَنْتِي لَمْ تَعْبِرْ بَعْضُ مَا قَدْ صَنَعْتُمْ * لَأَنْتَحِينَ ^{لَأَنْتَحِينَ} ^{لِلْعَظْمِ} ^{ذُو} ^{أَنَا} عَارِقَةٌ ^{عَارِقَةٌ} by 'Ārik (M) at Tā'ī, (*I swear*), *if thou alter not some of what you have done, assuredly I will have recourse to breaking the bone, the flesh of which I am gnawing* (T), which in their {best known (R, IA)} *dial.* is invariable in gender and number, {as

فَإِنَّ الْمَاءَ مَاءُ أَبِي وَجَدِّي * وَبِئْرِي ^{وَبِئْرِي} ^{ذُو} حَفْرَتِي وَذُو ^{وَذُو} حُلُوبِي ^{حُلُوبِي}

(IY, R), by Sinān Ibn AlFahl of the Banū Umm AlKahf of Ṭayyi, *For verily the water is the water of my father and my grandfather, and my well, which I dug, and which I cased* (T), i. e. ^{الَّتِي} ^{حَفَرْتُهَا} (R),} and *uninfl.* also (IY, R, IA), as

فَمَا كَرَامَ ^{فَمَا كَرَامَ} ^{مُوسِرُونَ} أَتَيْتَهُمْ * فَحَسْبِي ^{فَحَسْبِي} ^{مِنْ} ^{ذُو} عِنْدَهُمْ مَا كَفَانِيَا ^{مَا كَفَانِيَا}

(below) (IY, IA); while the 2nd *dial.*, transmitted by Jz, has ذُو for the *masc.* and ذَاتُ for the *fem.*, in the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*; the 3rd, also transmitted by him, has the

same as the 2nd, except that ذَوَاتٌ is said for the *fem.* *pl.* in the three cases; and in the 4th, transmitted by IDn, it is variable, like ذُو i. q. صَاحِبٌ, and *infl.* with the inflection of all its variations (16) (R)]: (f) ذَا [186] (M, R, IA, Sh). The conjuncts [except الذَّانِ (171), اللَّتَانِ, and أَي (184) (Sh)] are *uninfl.* (R, Sh), upon quiescence, like الَّذِي, الَّتِي, مَنْ, and مَا; Fath, like الَّذِي; Kasr, like الْوَلَدِ with prolongation, a *dial.* *var.* of الْوَلَدِ i. q. الَّذِينَ, as

أَبَى اللّٰهَ لِلشِّمِّ الْوَلَدِ كَانَهُمْ * سَيُوفُ أَجَادِ الْقَيْنِ يَوْمًا صَقَالَهَا

[by Kuthayyir, *God has refused to the highminded, who are as though they were swords whose furbishing the smith has done excellently one day* (FA)]; and Damm, like ذَاتُ i. q. الَّتِي in the *dial.* of some of Tayyi, as Fr relates that he heard a beggar say in the congregational mosque بِالْفَضْلِ ذُو فَضْلِكُمُ اللّٰهُ بِهِ وَالْكَرَامَةُ ذَاتُ اِكْرَامِكُمُ اللّٰهُ بِهِ *By the excellence that God has made you to excel with, and the honor that God has honored you with, بِهِ* with Fath of the ب being orig. بِهَا (Sh): either because some of them are constituted like *ps.*, vid. مَنْ, مَا, and the ل, while the remainder are made to accord with

them for the sake of uniformity ; or because they need a *conj.* and *rel.* [177] in their completeness as a part [of the *prop.*], as the *p.* needs something else in its quality of part [497]. The inflection ought to rest upon the conjunct [177], because it is the [word] intended by the speech, the *conj.* being put only to explain it ; and the proof is the appearance of the inflection in the conjunct ^{٢٤}أَي, and similarly in ^{٢٥}الَّذَانِ and ^{٢٦}الَّتَانِ according to those who say that they are *infl.* [171]. And some say that the *conj.* is *infl.* with the inflection of the conjunct, because they believe it to be the *ep.* of the conjunct, by reason of its explaining the latter, like the *props.* occurring as *eps.* of *indets.* [1, 144]: but this of no account, because the conjuncts are *dets.* [262] by common consent, and *props.* do not occur as *eps.* of *dets.*; and the majority hold that the *conj.* has no place in inflection [1], since it is not replaceable by the single term, like [the *prop.* that occurs in the place of] the *ep.*, *enunc.*, *d. s.*, and *post.* [*n.*] (R). It has reached me that one grammarian used to instruct his pupils to say that the conjunct and its *conj.* were in such and such a position, arguing that they were like one word ; but the truth is what I have premised, [vid. that the *conj.* has no place, and the conjunct has a place. but that their aggregate is not said to have, or not to have a place (DM),] as is proved by the appearance of the inflection in the conjunct itself, as in XLI. 29. [above], the reading ^{٢٧}أَيُّهُمَ ^{٢٨}أَشَدُّ XIX. 70. [184] and version ^{٢٩}فَسَلِمَ

عَلَىٰ أَيِّهِمُ الْخ [184], the saying of the Tā'i [poet (DM), Manẓūr Ibn Suhaim (T, DM) alFak'asī (DM),]

فَأَمَّا كِرَامُ مُوسِرُونَ أَتَيْتَهُمْ * فَحَسْبِيَ مِنْ ذِي عِنْدِهِمْ مَا كَفَانِيَا
[And, if wealthy nobles (be repaired to, if) I come to them, my sufficiency of what is with them is what suffices me (T)], نَحْنُ الَّذِينَ الْخ [above], and the saying of the Hudbailī

هُمْ الَّذِينَ فَكَّرُوا الْغَلَ عَنِّي * بِمَرِّ الشَّاهِجَانِ وَهُمْ جُنَاحِي
(ML) They are those who loosed the yoke from off me in Marv AshShāhijān; and they are my strength (Jsh). The conjuncts are vague [262], because they are applicable to every thing, animate, inanimate, etc.; as هَذَا، هَؤُلَاءِ، and the like *dems.* [175] are applicable to every thing (IY).

§. 177. The conjunct is what does not become complete as a part [of the *prop.* (R), i. e. *inch.*, *enunc.*, *ag.* (R, Jm), *obj.*, etc. (Jm),] except by means of a *conj.* and *rel.* [176]. Its *conj.* [except the *conj.* of أَل (R)] is an enunciatory *prop.*; [but the place of the *prop.* is sometimes supplied by an *adv.* or *prep.* meant to be understood as accompanied by a *v.* and *ag.*, the latter of which is the *rel.* or the belonging of the *rel.* (R), as عَلَى السَّطْحِ غَلَامَةٌ or رَأَيْتُ الَّذِي عَلَى السَّطْحِ I saw him that, or whose manservant, was on the flat roof (MAR)]:

and the *rel.* is a *pron.* [in the *conj.* (R)] belonging to the conjunct (IH); but the place of the *rel.* is sometimes, though rarely, supplied by the explicit *n.* (R). The *conj.* is one of four things, (1) the *v.* and *ag.*, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي قَامَ *He that stood came to me*: (2) the *inch.* and *enunc.*, in which case you may put the *rel.* with (a) the *inch.* alone, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي أَبُوهُ قَائِمٌ *He whose father is standing came to me*; (b) the *enunc.* alone, as الَّذِي أَخُوهُ غُلَامٌ زَيْدٌ *He that thy brother is the manservant of is Zaid*; (c) both of them, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي أَبُوهُ أَخُوهُ زَيْدٌ *He whose father is his brother is Zaid*: (3) the *prot.* and *apod.*, in which case you may put the *rel.* in (α) the 1st *prop.*, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَأْتَهُ يَأْتِكَ عَمْرُو *He that is such that, if thou come to him, 'Amr will come to thee, came to me*; (b) the 2nd *prop.*, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَكْرُمَ زَيْدًا يَشْكُرَكَ *He that, if thou honor Zaid, will thank thee, came to me*; (c) both of them, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي إِنْ تَزُرَّهُ يَحْسِنَ إِلَيْكَ *He that, if thou visit him, will do good to thee, came to me*, the 1st *rel.* being the *acc.* ذَا in تَزُرُّهُ, and the 2nd the *nom. pron.* in يَحْسِنُ: (4) the *adv.* or *prep.* and *gen.*, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي عِنْدَكَ زَيْدٌ *He that is with thee is Zaid* and جَاوَنِي الَّذِي فِي الدَّارِ خَالِدٌ *He that is in the house*

is *Khālid*, in which case the *adv.* [or *prep.* and *gen.*] depends upon a suppressed *v.*, as ^{اَسْتَقَرَّ} ^{حَلَّ}, and the like, not upon an *act. part.*, because the *conj.* is not a single term, but only a *prop.* [67,498] (IY). The *conj.* must be an enunciatory *prop.*, because the purport of the *conj.* must be a predicament whose occurrence is known to the person addressed before the state of address [178], whereas the purport of the originative and requisitive *props.* is not known except after the expression of their formulas; while the saying of the poet

وَإِنِّي لَأَرْجِي نَظْرَةً قَبْلَ الَّتِي * لَعَلِّي وَإِنْ شَطَطَتْ نَوَاهَا أَزُورُهَا

[And verily I am hoping for one look at her that, (I say), perhaps I, even if her destination be far, shall visit, where ^{أَزُورُهَا} ^{لَعَلِّي} is an originative *prop.* (Jsh),] is like

الَّتِي أَقُولُ لَعَلِّي أَزُورُهَا [144], i. e. ^{جَاءُوا} ^{بِمَنْقِي} ^{الْمَخ}: but the juratory *prop.* sometimes occurs as a *conj.*, as IV.

74. [149], i. e. ^{لَعَلِّي} ^{وَاللَّهُ} ^{لِيُبَيِّطَنَّ}; and IKh allows the admirative to occur as a *conj.* without subaudition of *saying*, as ^{جَاءَنِي} ^{الَّذِي} ^{مَا أَحْسَدُهُ}, while IBdh and the rest of the moderns disallow it, which is the right view, because it is originative (R). The *prop.* that *ns.* are conjoined with needs a *cop.*, which is (1) mostly a *pron.*, (a) mentioned, as ^{الَّذِينَ} ^{يُؤْمِنُونَ} II. 2. *Who believe*, XXXVI. 35. [63], XLIII. 71. [498], [where Nāfi', Ibn

‘Āmir and Ḥafṣ read تَشْتَهِي (B, DM) according to the o. f. (B), and the rest of the Seven تَشْتَهِي (DM),] and مَا تَأْكُلُونَ مِنْهُ XXIII. 34. 35. *He eateth of what ye eat of*; (b) supplied, as XIX. 70. [184], وَمَا عَمَلْتُمَا XXXVI. 35. [in the reading of the KK (K, B) except Ḥafṣ (B)], XLIII. 71., and XXIII. 35. [507], suppression from the *conj.* being of stronger authority than from the *ep.*, and from the *ep.* than from the *enunc.* [63, 138]: (2) sometimes an explicit *n.*, as

فَيَا رَبَّ لَيْلَى أَنْتَ فِي كُلِّ مَوْطِنٍ
وَأَنْتَ الَّذِي فِي رَحْمَةِ اللَّهِ أَطْمَعُ

[by the Majnūn of Lailā al-Āmiriyya, *Then, O Lord of Lailā, Thou art in every place; and Thou art He Whose mercy I long for* (Jsh)], which is rare, constructively, say they, فِي رَحْمَتِهِ, though they might construe it to be فِي رَحْمَتِكَ, like

وَأَنْتَ الَّذِي أَخْلَقْتَنِي مَا وَعَدْتَنِي

[*And thou art he that disappointed me of what thou promisedst me* (Jsh)]; and, according to this, the saying of Z that in VI. 1. [540] the coupling by ثُمَّ may be to the verbal *prop.* [خُلِقَ السَّمَوَاتِ (K)] is weak, because it involves the text's being an instance of this rare [con-

struction], the *n. f.* being ^{بِ}, since the coupled to the *conj.*, being a *conj.*, must have a *cop.* (ML). When the conjunct or its qualified is an *enunc.* to a 1st *pers.*, the *rel.* may be of the 3rd *pers.*, which is more frequent, because explicit *ns.* are all of the 3rd *pers.*, as اَنَا الَّذِي because explicit *ns.* are all of the 3rd *pers.*, as اَنَا الَّذِي ^{قَالَ} كَذَا ; or of the 1st *pers.* by syllepsis, as says 'Alī

اَنَا الَّذِي سَمَّيْتُ أُمِّي حَيْدَرَةً * ضَرْغَامَ أَجَامٍ وَلَيْثَ قَسُورَةً

[I am he that my mother named *Haidar* (with the δ of silence for pause), a lion of thickets, and a mighty lion! (Jsh)]: and similarly when the conjunct or its

qualified is an *enunc.* to a 2nd *pers.*, as أَنْتَ الرَّجُلُ الَّذِي ^{قُلْتَ} كَذَا, which is more frequent, or ^{قُلْتَ} كَذَا by syllepsis.

All of this is when it does not denote *comparison*, with which only the 3rd *pers.* is allowable, as اَنَا حَاتِمُ الَّذِي ^{وَهَبَ} أَلْمِثِينَ *I am (like) Hātim, who gave hundreds*, i. e.

أَنَا الَّذِي قُلْتُ كَذَا وَضَرَبْتُ ^{مِثْلَ} حَاتِمَ : and, if there be two *prons.*, you may, except in *comparison*, make one of them accord with the letter,

and the other with the sense, as اَنَا الَّذِي قُلْتُ كَذَا وَضَرَبْتُ ^{مِثْلَ} حَاتِمَ and اَنَا الَّذِي قُلْتُ كَذَا وَضَرَبْتُ ^{مِثْلَ} حَاتِمَ (R). The

conj. of اَلْ is an *act.* or *pass. part.* (IH). The *act. part.*

in اَلضَّارِبُ is in the sense of the *v.*; and, with the [*pron.* (IY)] governed in the *nom.* by it, is [constructively (IY)]

a *prop.* occurring as *conj.* to the *ل* ; while the mention [27] relates from it to the *ل* , as it relates to *النَّبِيَّ* (M).

The *o. f.* of *الضَّارِبُ* and *المَضْرُوبُ* [176] is *الضَّرَبُ* and *الضَّرِبُ* ; but, disliking that the *n. ل* , which resembles the *p. ل* in letter, as is obvious, and in sense, as becoming with what it is prefixed to *det.*, like the *p.* with what it is prefixed to, should be prefixed to the semblance of the *v.*, they transform the *v.* into the semblance of the *n.*, the *act. v.* into the semblance of the *act. part.*, and the *pass. v.* into the semblance of the *pass. part.*, because the two meanings are approximate, since the meaning of *زَيْدٌ ضَارِبٌ* is *زَيْدٌ ضَرَبَ* or *يَضْرِبُ* , and that of *زَيْدٌ مَضْرُوبٌ* is *زَيْدٌ ضَرِبَ* or *يَضْرِبُ* : and it is because this *conj.* is a *v.* in the semblance of a *n.* that it governs when in the sense of the past [345] ; whereas, if it were really an *act.* or *pass. part.*, it would not govern when in the sense of the past, like the synarthrous. The inflection ought to be upon the conjunct [176] ; but, since the *n. ل* is in the semblance of the *p. ل* , its inflection is transferred to its *conj.*, as in the case of *أَلَا* when it becomes *i. q.* *غَيْرٌ*

[90], as *مَرَرْتُ بِالضَّارِبِ* , *رَأَيْتُ الضَّارِبَ* , *جَاءَنِي الضَّارِبُ* , and *الضَّارِبُ* (R). *أَل* is sometimes [anomalously (IA)] conjoined [in poetry (R)] with (1) the nominal *prop.* (R, IA, ML), as

مِنَ الْقَوْمِ الرَّسُولُ اللَّهُ مِنْهُمْ * لَهُمْ دَانَتْ رِقَابُ بَنِي مُعَدٍّ

[I am of the people that the Apostle of God is of, that the necks of the children of Ma'add have submitted themselves to! (J)]: (2) the *adv.*, [i. e., says Shm, the *att. adv.*, in which the meaning of its *op.* resides, so that it becomes in the predicament of the *prop.* (DM),] as

مَنْ لَا يَزَالُ شَاكِرًا عَلَى الْمَعَّةِ * فَهُوَ حَرٌّ بِعَيْشَةٍ ذَاتِ سَعَةٍ

(IA, ML) *Whoso ceases not to be thankful to God for what is with him is worthy of a life endowed with plenty* (J): (3) the [verbal *prop.* whose *v.* is an (ML)] *aor.* (R, IA, ML), as

يَقُولُ الْخَنَىٰ وَابْغَضَ الْعَجَمُ نَامِقًا

إِلَىٰ رَبَّنَا صَوْتَ الْحِمَارِ الِّيَجْدَعُ

(R, ML), by Dhu -lKhiraḳ at-Tuhawī (FA, Jsh), *He speaks foul language, when the most hateful of the voices of the dumb brutes, when emitting sound, unto our Lord is the voice of the ass that is tied up* (DM, Jsh), whence

مَا أَنْتَ بِالْحَكَمِ التَّرْضَىٰ حُكُومَتُهُ

وَلَا الْأَصِيلُ وَلَا ذِي الرَّايِ وَالْجَدَلِ

[(2), by AlFarazdak, *Thou art not the judge whose judgment is approved, nor the man of pure lineage, nor the possessor of intelligence and power of controversy, where the J of the conjunct اَلْ may be incorporated into the ت or not, contrary to the J of the p. اَلْ (749) (J)];*

and this, according to the majority of the BB, is peculiar to poetry, while IM elsewhere asserts that it is allowable in a case of choice (IA). That [prefixion (DM)] is a proof that ^أأل is not a *p.* of determination, [because the determinative is prefixed only to single terms (DM)]; but the whole is peculiar to poetry, contrary to the opinion of Akh and IM on the last (ML). And the KK hold that the *prim.* substantive made *det.* by the ^أأ may be a conjunct; and say on ^أأَنْتَ ^أالْبَيْتِ ^أأَنْتَ [below] that it is constructively ^أأَنْتَ ^أأَنْتِ ^أأَكْرَمُ ^أأَنْتَ *assuredly thou art the House that I honor etc*, but that it is not vague like the rest of the conjunct *us.* [176]. The conjunct and *conj.* are like two parts of one *n.*; and, priority being due to the conjunct, because the *conj.* is explanatory of it, posteriority is necessary for the *conj.*: so that neither the *conj.* nor any part of it precedes the conjunct; nor does the *conj.* or what depends upon it govern what precedes the conjunct, because that *reg.* would then be part of the *conj.*; nor does the *conj.* depend upon what precedes the conjunct, through being headed by ^أأَنْتَ, ^أأَنْتِ, the sign of the *correl.* of the oath [600], or anything else that would have any dependence upon what precedes the conjunct, because the *conj.* is part of the conjunct, but not of anything else; nor is the conjunct separated from the *conj.*, nor part of the *conj.* from part, by an *appos.* of the conjunct, like the *corrob., ep.* [147], *subst., synd*

expl., and coupled, or by an *enunc.* of, or *exc.* from, the conjunct, since these things come only after the completion of the word. But in poetry a conjunct occurs coupled to another before the *conj.*; while what follows them is a *conj.* either to both of them together or to the last, the *conj.* of the first being in the latter case suppressed, indicated by the one expressed, as will be shown below in the suppressibility of the *conj.* upon the existence of indication: and sometimes the conjunct is separated from the *conj.* by the *reg.* of the *conj.*, as ^{الَّذِي} ^{أَيَّاهُ} ^{ضُرِبْتُ}, because the separation is not by an [expression] extraneous to both of them; whereas such [a separation] is not allowable when the conjunct is a *p.* [75], so that ^{أَعْجَبْنِي} ^{أَنْ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{ضُرِبْتُ} is not said, because the conjunct *ps.* [497], being infinitival *ps.* [571], which with the *prop.* after them are renderable by the *inf. n.*, require to be near the implier of the *inf. n.*; and similarly in the case of the conjunct ^{أَلْ}, since it is prefixed only to a *v.* in the semblance of an *act.* or *pass.* participial *n.*, so that it and what it is prefixed to are like the *p.* ^{أَلْ} and what it is prefixed to, which are not separated: and part of the *conj.* may be separated from part by something coupled to the *prop.* that is a *conj.*, as you say in the *cat.* of contest [22], when making the 1st govern, ^{الَّذِي} ^{ضُرِبْتُ} ^{وَضُرِبُونِي} ^{غِلْمَانَهُ} ^{زَيْدٌ} *He whose menservants I beat (and they beat me) was Zaid*, since the separation is not

by an [expression] extraneous to the *conj.*; and part of the *conj.* precedes part, as جَاوَنِي الَّذِي مَضَلْتُ أَبَوَهُ , [where the *enunc.* precedes the *inch.*,] and جَاوَنِي الَّذِي , [where the *obj.* precedes the *ag.*,] since there is nothing to prevent it (R). Suppression of the conjunct *n.* [other than اَل (R)] is allowed by the KK (R, ML) and Akh (ML), contrary to the opinion of the BB: the former say that XXXVII. 164. [149] means اَلَّا مِنْ لَهْ اَلْحَ save (him) that hath etc; and like it is the saying of AlMutanabbi

بِئْسَ اللَّيَالِي سَهَرْتُ مِنْ طَرَبِي
شَوْقًا إِلَى مَنْ يَبِيتُ يَرْقُدهَا

[Most evil are the nights that I have been sleepless in from my passion because of my longing for her that passes the nights sleeping through them (W), i. e. اَلَّتِي سَهَرْتُ (MAR)]; and the saying [of Abù Dhu'aib (Mb)]

لَعَمْرِي لَأَنْتَ الْبَيْتُ أَكْرَمُ أَهْلِهِ * وَاقْعُدْ فِي أَفْيَائِهِ بِالْأَصَائِلِ
[above] By my life, assuredly thou art the House that I honor the people of, and that I sit in the shades of in the evenings may be an instance of this (R): and IM follows them, but stipulates that it should be coupled to another conjunct; and among their proofs are اَمَّا بِالَّذِي

XXIX. 45. *We believe in that which hath been revealed to us and (that) which hath been revealed to you,*

أَمِنْ يَهْجُو رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مِنْكُمْ * وَيَمْدَحُهُ وَيَذَمُّهُ سَوَاءٌ

by Ḥassān [Ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī, *Are he of you that satirizes the Apostle of God and (he) that praises him and helps him equal? (Jsh)*], and

مَا الَّذِي دَابَهُ أَحْتِيَاظٌ وَحَزْمٌ * وَهَوَاةٌ أَطَاعَ يَسْتَرِيَابِي

[*He whose habit is precaution and discretion and (he) that obeys his passion are not equal (Jsh)*], i. e. وَالَّذِي (ML): nor is there any reason, as respects analogy, for the disallowance of that by the BB, since some of the letters of the word are sometimes suppressed, even a ف or ع, as شَيْئَةٌ [699] and سَةٌ [orig. سَتَةٌ (MAR)], and the conjunct is not more adhesive than they (R). Suppression of the conj. [of the conjunct n. other than أَل (R), while the conjunct remains (DM)], is allowable, though rare (R, ML), when the conj. is known (R) through the indication of another conj., as

وَعِنْدَ الَّذِي وَاللَّاتِ عَدْنُكَ أَحَنَّةٌ
عَلَيْكَ فَلَا يَغْرُزُكَ كَيْدُ الْعَوَائِدِ

[*And in him (that visited thee when sick) and those women that visited thee when sick there is rancour against thee: then let not the cunning of the female visitors of the sick dupe thee (Jsh)*], i. e. ^{الَّذِي} ^{عَادَكَ} ; or of something else, [like the context (DM),] as

نَحْنُ الْأُولَى فَاجْمَعْ جُومَ * عَكَ ثُمَّ وَجْهَهُمُ الْيَدَا

[by 'Abīd Ibn alAbras, *We are they (that have been renowned for valor): then muster thou thy hosts, and afterwards direct them towards us (Jsh)*], i. e. ^{الْأُولَى} ^{عَرَفُوا} (ML): and is invariably practised with ^{الَّتِي} ^{بِالشَّجَاعَةِ}

[293] followed by ^{الَّتِي} coupled to it, when calamities are intended by them, in order that its suppression may import that the two calamities, the little and great, have arrived at such an inexplicable extreme of magnitude that they are left in their vagueness without any explanatory conj. (R): the poet says

بَعْدَ اللَّتِي وَاللَّتِي وَالَّتِي * إِذَا عَلَتْهَا أَنْفُسُ تَرَدَّتْ

where with each ^{الَّتِي}, as some say, the counterpart of the cond. prop. mentioned, but, as others say, ^{دَقَّتْ}, because the dim. necessarily involves that, or, as others say, ^{عَظُمَتْ}, because the dim. is one of magnification, as in ^{دَوْبِهَا} ^{لُغْ} [117], is to be supplied, *After that calamity (which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown,*

or which has become little or great, and that calamity (which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown, or which has become little or great), and that calamity, which, when souls overcome it, is overthrown (ML). The *rel.* of **أَلْ** may not be suppressed, even if it be an *obj.*, because of the obscurity of **أَلْ** 's conjunctness, the *pron.* being one of the indications of its conjunctness; nor may one of two *rels.* when combined in the *conj.*, as **زَيْدٌ ضَرْبَتُهُ فِي دَارِهِ**, since the remaining one would enable that suppressed one to be dispensed with, so that no indication of it would exist (R). The *pron.* [relating to the conjunct (IA)] may be suppressed, (1) if it be a *nom.*, only when it is an *inch.* and its *enunc.* is [a single term (IA),] not a *prop.* or [*att.* (IA)] *adv.* or *prep.* and *gen.*; because, if the *enunc.* were one of them, the fact that some thing had been suppressed would not be known, [since the *prop.* and *adv.* with the *rel.* in them are suitable for being a *conj.* (R)]: the [prescribed (R)] *inch.* may be suppressed, (a) [as the BB say (R),] in the *conj.* of (a) **أَيُّ**, [without any other condition, as XIX. 70. and **فَسَلَّمَ النَّحْ** (184), because lengthiness is realized in the conjunct itself by means of the prefixion (R),] even if the *conj.* be not long; (b) something else, only when the *conj.* is long, [as **وَهُوَ الَّذِي فِي السَّمَاءِ إِلَهُ وَفِي الْأَرْضِ** XLIII. 84. And He is the One (that) is God in heaven and God in earth (498), the *conj.* being long

through the coupling to it (R)]: (b) as the KK allow,
regularly, [in the conj. of اِى or anything else, with or
(R)] without length [of the conj. (IA)], as in the
[anomalous (R)] reading [of Yahyā Ibn Ya'mar (K)]
^{أَحْسَنُ} تَمَامًا عَلَى الَّذِي أَحْسَنُ VI. 155. To complete that (which)
was a most goodly religion, [i. e. هُوَ أَحْسَنُ : but it is
allowed that مَا in سَيِّمًا زَيْدٌ لَا is conjunct (89), and زَيْدٌ
the enunc. of a suppressed inch., i. e. الَّذِي هُوَ ,
زَيْدٌ, the rel., vid. the inch. هُوَ, being necessarily sup-
pressed; so that this is a place where the head of the
conj. is necessarily suppressed with something else than
اِى, when the conj. is not long; and it is regular. not
anomalous (IA)]: (2) if it be an acc., provided that it
be not detached [after اِلَّا, as جَاؤُنِي الَّذِي مَا ضَرَبْتَ اِلَّا ,
اِيَّاهُ, while in other cases there is no disallowance, as
اعْطَيْتُهُمْ اِيَّاهُ , i. e. اَعْطَيْتُهُمُ الزَّيْدَانِ الَّذِي اعْطَيْتَهُمَا , and
الَّذِي اَنَا ضَارِبُ زَيْدٍ (below), i. e. اَنْزَلْتُ اِيَّاهُ (R)], and
that it be governed by the [att. (IA)] [for qual. (IA)],
because the pron. is then a complement (R), as ذُرْنِي
وَمِنْ خَلَقْتُمْ وَحِيدًا LXXIV. 11. Leave thou Me and
him (that) I have created alone and XXV. 43. (63), i. e.
بَعَثْتُمْ وَاَنَا خَلَقْتُمْ, and similarly

مَا إِلَٰهٌ مُّوَلِّيكَ فَضْلًا فَاحْمَدْنَهُ بِهِ
فَمَا لَدَيَّ غَيْرُهُ نَفْعٌ وَلَا ضَرَرٌ

{by Abu-lFath, *What God is vouchsafing thee is bounty: then do thou praise Him for it; for profit is not with any other than Him, nor injury* (J)}, i. e. *مُولِيكُهُ*; and its suppression from the *v.* above mentioned is frequent, but from the *qual.* is rare (IA)]: (3) if it be a *gen.*, provided that it be governed by (a) prefixion [of an *ep.* constructively governing it in the *acc.* (R), (e. g.) of an *act. part.* in the sense of the present or future (IA), as *زَيْدٌ أَنَا ضَارِبٌ زَيْدٍ* (above), i. e. *ضَارِبُهُ* (R), whence XX. 75. *Then decree thou that (which) thou art about to decree*, i. e. *قَاضِيَةٌ* (IA)]: (b) a [specified (R)] *p.*, [because the *prep.*, being unavoidably suppressed after suppression of the *gen.*, since a *prep.* does not remain without a *gen.*, ought to be specified, to the end that it may not be confounded after the suppression with any other, as *انْسَجِدْ لِمَا تَأْمُرُنَا بِهِ* XXV. 61. *What! shall we bow down to that (which) thou commandest us (to honor)*, i. e. *تَأْمُرُنَا بِهِ*, i. e. *بِأَكْرَامِهِ*, and *فَاعْصِ مَا تَأْمُرُ* XV. 94. *Then preach thou openly that (which) thou art commanded (to make manifest)*, i. e. *تَأْمُرُ بِهِ*, i. e. *بِإِطْلَاقِهِ*, and

فَقُلْتُ لَهَا لَا وَالَّذِي حَجَّ حَاتِمٌ * أَخُونِي عَهْدًا إِنِّي غَيْرُ خَوَانٍ

Then said I to her, I will not, by that (which) Hātim has performed the pilgrimage (to), be unfaithful to thee in a covenant: verily I am not faithless, i. e.

حَجَّ حَاتِمٌ إِلَى، the *prep.* being regularly specified (R)] when the conjunct [or its qualified (R, FA)] is governed in the *gen.* by a *p.* like it in [letter and (IA)] sense, and the two *ops.* [498] are alike [in crude-form (IA)], as مَرَرْتُ بِالَّذِي مَرَرْتُ [or *أَنْتَ مَارٌ* (IA)], i. e. بِ (R, IA); whence XXIII. 35. [507], i. e. مِنْهُ، and

وَقَدْ كُنْتُ تَخْفِي حُبَّ سَمْرَاءَ حَقْبَةً
فَبِمَ لَأَنَّ مِنْهَا بِالَّذِي أَنْتَ بَائِئٌ

[by 'Antara, *And*, by God, thou hast been hiding the love of Samrā a long time: then divulge thou now (orig.

الآن) of the love of her that (which) thou art about to divulge (J)], i. e. بِ (IA), and as مَرَرْتُ بِزَيْدٍ الَّذِي مَرَرْتُ (R), whence

لَا تَرْكَنْنِي إِلَى الْأَمْرِ الَّذِي رَكَنْتُ
أَبْنَاءَ يَعْصَرَ حِينَ اضْطَرَّهَا الْقَدَرُ

by Ka'b Ibn Zuhair, *Do not thou incline to the matter (that) the sons of Ya'sur inclined (to) when destiny con-*

strained them, i. e. رَكَذَتْ إِلَيْهِ (f'A); but sometimes the *gen.* governed by a *p.* is suppressed, though the *p.* is not specified, as الَّذِي مَرَرْتُ زَيْدٌ, i. e. مَرَرْتُ بِهِ, which might be مَرَرْتُ مَعَهُ or لَهُ or the like: and in case (3, b) Ks hold's the suppression of the *prep.* and *gen.* to be gradual, while S and Akh hold it to be simultaneous [1, 144] (R).

§ 178. الَّذِي is constituted a connective to the qualification of *det.* by *props.* [176]: but [the fact announced by] the *prop.* that it is conjoined with ought to be known to the person addressed [177], as in your saying هَذَا الَّذِي قَدِمَ مِنَ الْحَضْرَةِ This man, who has arrived from town to him whom that [fact] has reached, [because the object of the *conj. prop.* is to determine the mentioned by means of that state of it which is known by the person addressed, in order that it may afterwards be predicable of, the *conj.* being the contrary of the attribute, which ought to be unknown to the person addressed, because the object of the attribute is to communicate to the person addressed some state of him that he knows; and therefore you do not say جَاءَ الَّذِي قَامَ He that stood came except to him that knows his standing, but is ignorant of his coming, because جَاءَ is an attribute and قَامَ a *conj.*; nor أَقْبَلَ الَّذِي أَبْرَأَ مِنْطَلَقٌ He whose father was departing approached except to

him that knows his father's *departure*, but is ignorant of his *approach* (IY)]. And, because of their deeming it too long by reason of its *conj.*, together with frequency of usage, they lighten it without any [other (AAz)] reason, saying ^{اللَّ} by elision of the ^ي [176], and then ^{اللَّ} by elision of the vowel; and even suppress it altogether, contenting themselves with the [^ل and (IY)] ^ل [176] in its stead: and do the like with its *fem.*, saying ^{اللَّت} [176], ^{اللَّتْ}, and ^{هَنْدُ} ^{الضَّارِبَتَهُ} ^{هَنْدُ} i. q. ^{الَّتِي} ^{الَّتِي} : and elide the ^ي from its *du.* and *pl.* [176], as in the saying of [AlAkhṭal (ID, Jsh), or, as is said (Jsh),] AlFarazdak

أَبْنِي كَلَيْبٍ إِنْ عَمِيَ اللَّذَا * قَتَلَا الْمُلُوكَ وَفَكَكَا الْأَغْلَالَا

[O Banu Kulaib, verily my two paternal uncles were the two that slew the kings and loosed the yokes (Jsh)], ^{وَالَّذِي} ^{حَانَتْ} ^{الْفُجْ} ^{وَالَّذِي} ^{حَانَتْ} ^{الْفُجْ} [117], and IX. 70. [571] like them that have plunged; [though ^{الَّذِي} may be *sing.*, but indicate the *pl.*, in which case the *rel. pron.*, if *sing.*, is so from regard to the letter, and, if *pl.*, is so by syllepsis, as in the case of ^{مَنْ} (182); and similar is ^{وَالَّذِي} ^{جَاءَ} (182); and similar is XXXIX. 34. ^{بِالْصِّدْقِ} ^{وَصَدَقَ} ^{بِهِ} ^{أُولَئِكَ} ^{هُمُ} ^{الْمُتَّقُونَ} And he that hath spoken the truth and believed it, those are the pious, while in ^{مِثْلَهُمْ} ^{كَمِثْلِ} ^{الَّذِي} ^{اسْتَوْقَدَ} ^{نَارًا} ^{فَلَمَّا}

أَضَاءَتْ مَا حَوْلَهُ ذَهَبَ اللَّهُ بِنُورِهِمْ وَتَرَكَّهُمْ فِي ظُلُمَاتٍ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ II. 16. *Their similitude is like the similitude of him that hath kindled a fire, and that, when it hath brightened what is round him, God taketh away (503) the light of, and that He leaveth in darkness, seeing not the rel. pron. is now sing. and now pl. (IY)].*

§ 179. The range of **الَّذِي** in the process of enunciation is wider than that of the **ل** syn. with it, since **الَّذِي** is prefixed in the case of the nominal and verbal props., but the **ل** only in the case of the verbal: thus, when you make an *enunc.* from **زَيْدٌ** in **قَامَ زَيْدٌ** and **زَيْدٌ** **الَّذِي هُوَ مُنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ** and **الَّذِي قَامَ زَيْدٌ**, **مُنْطَلِقٌ**, you say **زَيْدٌ** **قَامَ** **الَّذِي** **قَامَ** **زَيْدٌ**, **مُنْطَلِقٌ**, and **الَّذِي هُوَ مُنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ**, but not **الَّذِي هُوَ مُنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ** (M), because **أَل** is not prefixed to the *inch.* and *enunc.* [177] (IY). An *enunc.* is not made to **أَل** except from a *n.* in the verbal *prop.* exclusively, because the *conj.* of **أَل** is an *act.* or *pass. part.* [177], which with its *nom.* can be moulded from the verbal *prop.*, when the *v.* is *act.* or *pass.* respectively, since the sense of the *act.* or *pass. part.* is akin to the sense of **فَعَلَ** and **يَفْعَلُ** or **فُعِلَ** and **يُفْعَلُ**, as **زَيْدٌ** **ضَارِبٌ**, i. e. **ضَرَبَ** or **يَضْرِبُ**, and **زَيْدٌ** **مَضْرُوبٌ**, i. e. **ضَرِبَ** or **يُضْرَبُ**; whereas an *act.* or *pass. part.* with its *nom.* is

not in the sense of the nominal *prop.*, so that one of them with the *nom.* should be moulded from it. In such as ^{أَضْرَبَ} ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} and ^{مَا} ^{مَضْرُوبَ} ^{الْبَكَرَانِ} [24] indeed they with their *noms.* are nominal [*props.*]; but here they are preceded by two *ps.* that prevent their occurrence as *conjs.* of the **ل**, as will be shown immediately. The *v.* that the *conj.* of **أَل** is moulded from must be plastic, since the *act.* or *pass. part.* does not come from the aplastic, like ^{لَيْسَ}, ^{عَسَى}, ^{حَبْنًا}, ^{بِئْسَ}, ^{نَعَمْ}; and must not be preceded by a *p.* whose meaning is not imported from the *act.* or *pass. part.*, like the ^{سَى}, ^{سَرَفٌ}, *neg. p.*, and *interrog. p.* (R). This process has been instituted by the GG for the [examination and (IA)] exercise of the student (R, IA) in the questions that he has learnt in some of the *cats.* of syntax (R). Enunciation from every *n.* in a [complete enunciatory (IY)] *prop.* is permissible, [because these *props.* occur as *conjs.* (177) and *eps.* (144) (IY),] except when some preventive [mentioned below (IY)] prevents [it (IY)]. The method of enunciation is to put the conjunct [^{أَلْذِي} or ^{أَل} (IY)] at the beginning of the *prop.* [in the position of an *inch.* (IY)], and relegate the *n.* [that you mean to make an *enunc.* from (IY)] to its end, [making it an *enunc.* to the conjunct, and (IY)] putting in its place a *pron.* relating to the conjunct: e. g., in making an *enunc.* (1) from ^{زَيْدٌ} and

and الَّذِي هُوَ مُنْطَلِقٌ زَيْدٌ you say زَيْدٌ مُنْطَلِقٌ in مُنْطَلِقٌ
 قَامَ غُلَامٌ خَالِدٌ in خَالِدٌ (2) from خَالِدٌ ; الَّذِي زَيْدٌ هُوَ مُنْطَلِقٌ
 ; الْقَائِمُ غُلَامُهُ خَالِدٌ or الَّذِي قَامَ غُلَامُهُ خَالِدٌ [you say (IY)]

ضَرَبْتُ in (IY) زَيْدًا [and (IY)] n. [pro- (IY)] (3) from your
 الضَّارِبُ زَيْدًا or الَّذِي ضَرَبَ زَيْدًا أَنَا [you say (IY)] , زَيْدًا
 (IY); (4) الضَّارِبَةُ أَنَا زَيْدٌ or الَّذِي ضَرَبْتَهُ زَيْدٌ [and أَنَا

يَطِيرُ الذَّبَابُ فيَغْضَبُ زَيْدٌ in زَيْدٌ and الذَّبَابُ [you
 say (IY)] [27, 538, 540] الَّذِي يَطِيرُ فيَغْضَبُ زَيْدٌ الذَّبَابُ [27, 538, 540]
 or الَّذِي يَطِيرُ الطَّائِرُ فيَغْضَبُ زَيْدٌ الذَّبَابُ [418. A.], and يَطِيرُ
 فيَغْضَبُ [where يَطِيرُ coupled to فيَغْضَبُ], الذَّبَابُ فيَغْضَبُ زَيْدٌ

contains a mention relating to the *inch.* and con-
 junct الَّذِي, while the ف binds the two *props.* together,
 and makes them like one *prop.*, because it produces in
 them the sense of *condition*, i. e. الَّذِي إِنْ طَارَ الذَّبَابُ
 يَغْضَبُ زَيْدٌ He that, if the fly flies, becomes angry is
 Zaid, so that the relation of the *pron.* to the conjunct
 from one of them suffices (IY),] or الطَّائِرُ الذَّبَابُ فيَغْضَبُ
 زَيْدٌ (M), where الذَّبَابُ is governed in the *nom.* by [the
act. part. in] الطَّائِرُ, which does not contain a mention,
 because it governs an explicit *n.* in the *nom.*, while

يَغْضَبُ coupled to it contains a mention relating to the conjunct, and completes the *conj.* (IY). The conjunct must agree in number and gender with the *n.* made an *enunc.* to it; so that, when told to make an *enunc.* from

ضَرَبْتُ , ضَرَبْتُ الزَّيْدَيْنِ in هَذَا , and الزَّيْدَيْنِ , الزَّيْدَيْنِ اللَّذَانِ ضَرَبْتُهُمَا , you say ضَرَبْتُ هَذَا , and الزَّيْدَيْنِ الَّتِي ضَرَبْتُهَا هَذِهِ , الَّذِينَ ضَرَبْتَهُمُ الزَّيْدُونَ , الزَّيْدَانِ .

If the *qual.* occurring as *conj.* of اَلْ govern a *pron.* in the *nom.*, the *pron.*, if it relate to اَلْ , is latent; but, if it relate to something else, is detached: so that, when you say بَلَّغْتُ مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ اِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً , if you make an *enunc.* from the ت in بَلَّغْتُ , you say الْمَبْلُغُ مِنَ الزَّيْدَيْنِ He that conveyed a message from the two Zaid's to the 'Amr's was I, a *pron.* relating to اَلْ being in الْمَبْلُغُ ; but, if you make an *enunc.* from الزَّيْدَيْنِ ,

you say الْمَبْلُغُ اَنَا مِنْهُمَا اِلَى الْعَمْرَيْنِ رِسَالَةً الزَّيْدَانِ The two that I conveyed a message from to the 'Amr's were the two Zaid's, اَنَا being governed in the *nom.* by الْمَبْلُغُ , but not relating to اَلْ , because what is meant by اَلْ here is a *du.*, vid. the *n.* that the *enunc.* is made from; and, if you make an *enunc.* from الْعَمْرَيْنِ , you say الْمَبْلُغُ اَنَا الْعَمْرَيْنِ

exist, as ^٩ظريف ^٩ضربتة ^٩رجل ^٩الذي ^٩or ^٩غلام ^٩زيد (IA). Enunciation is disallowed in the case of (1) the *pron.* of the case [167], because it is entitled to the 1st place in the sentence, [does not relate to an explicit *n.*, and is expounded only by the *prop.* after it; whereas, if you made it an *enunc.*, it would become posterior, would relate to the conjunct before it, and would not be expounded by a *prop.* (IY)]: (2) the *pron.* in ^٩زيد ^٩منطلق ^٩in ^٩منطلق ^٩[26], the δ in ^٩زيد ^٩ضربتة ^٩[27], or [the δ in (IY)] ^٩منه ^٩in ^٩بدرهم ^٩منه ^٩منوان ^٩السمي ^٩[25, 27], because, if it [were replaced by a *pron.* that (IY)] related to the conjunct, the *inch.* [^٩زيد ^٩or ^٩السمي (IY)] would remain without a *rel.*: (3) the *inf. n.* or *d. s.* in such as ^٩ضربي ^٩زيذا ^٩قائما ^٩[29], because, (a) if you said ^٩الذي ^٩هو ^٩زيذا ^٩قائما ^٩ضربي, you would make the *pron.* [^٩هو (IY)] govern [^٩زيذا ^٩قائما] in the *acc.*, whereas the *inf. n.*, when expressed by a *pron.*, does not govern, so that ^٩مروري ^٩بزيدي ^٩حسني ^٩وهو ^٩is not allowable, because the *inf. n.* governs only through the letters of the *v.* contained in it, and through its being renderable by ^٩أن ^٩and the *v.*, while after the metonymy the letters of the *v.* quit it, and it is not renderable by ^٩أن ^٩and the *v.* (IY)]; (b) if you said

الَّذِي ضَرَبِي زَيْدًا آيَةً قَائِمٌ, you would express the *d. s. b.* a *pron.*, whereas only what may be made *det.* [78] mā be expressed by a *pron.* [262] (M).

§ 180. مَا is (1) a *det.*, (a) incomplete [44], which is the conjunct, as XVI. 98. [2]: (b) complete [520], (a) general, i. e. renderable by الشَّيْءُ, which is the one that is not preceded by a *n.* whereof it and its *op.* are an *ep.* in sense, as II. 273. [419], i. e. فَنِعْمَ الشَّيْءُ هِيَ most excellent will be the thing, they!, [where هِيَ (DM),] orig. اِبْدَاؤُهُم the display of them!, because the discourse is about the *display*, not about the *alms*, [is particularized by praise (DM)]; (b) particular, which is the one that is preceded by that [*n.* whereof it and its *op.* are an *ep.* in sense, the restriction *in sense* being added because the *ep.* in grammar is a suppressed word governing the *prop.* of مَا (DM)], and that is rendered from the letter of that *n.*, as غَسَلْتَهُ غَسْلًا نِعْمًا I washed him with a washing, whereof it is said, Most excellent is the washing!, i. e. نِعْمَ الغَسْلُ, [this غَسْلًا being the *n.*, and نِعْمَ and مَا an *ep.* of it in sense, orig. غَسْلًا مَقْرُولًا فِيهِ نِعْمَ, because the originative *prop.* is not used as an *ep.*, as they say on جَاءُوا بِمَنْقِيٍّ آلِخَ (144) (DM)]: most GG do not authorize the occurrence of مَا as a complete

det.; but some authorize it, among them IKh, who transmits it from S: (2) an *indet.*, (a) bare of the sense of the *p.*, (a) incomplete, which is the qualified, and is rendered by ^{شئ} , as ^{مررت بما معجب لك} *I passed by a thing pleasing to thee* [147], i. e. ^{بشيء معجب لك} ,

^{لما نافع يسعى اللبيب فلا تكن * لشيء بعيد نفعه الدهر ساعيا}
[For a profitable thing strives the sagacious: then be not thou striving for a thing whose profit is for ever distant (Jsh)], and

^{ربما تكره النفوس من الالم — رلة فرجة كحل العقال}

[by Umayya Ibn Abi -sSalt, *Many a thing (that) souls dislike of the matter has a relief like the unfastening of the rope that fastens together the foreshank and arms of the camel* (AAz)], i. e. ^{رب شيء تكرهه النفوس} , while

S says that ^{هذا ما لدى عتيب} L. 22. means *This [unbeliever (DM)] is a thing in my power, made ready (for Hell by my misleading him):* (b) complete, which occurs

in three *cats.*, (α) wonder, as ^{ما أحسن زيدا} *How goodly is Zaid!* [25, 479], i. e. ^{شيء حسن زيدا} *Something has made Zaid goodly!*, as all the BB decide, except Akh, who

allows it, and allows ^{ما} to be a conjunct *det.* or a qualified *indet.*; (β) the *cat.* of ^{نعم} and ^{بئس} , as in ^{غسلته الخ}

[above], i. e. ^{نعم شيئا} *Most excellent is it as a thing,* ^{ما}

being governed in the *acc.* as a *sp.* [of the vague *pron.* (DM)], according to many of the moderns, among them Z [471]; (γ) their saying, when they mean to exaggerate in predicating of any one the *frequent performance* of an act, like *writing*, ^{وَأَن زَيْدًا مِّمَّا أَن يَكْتُبَ}, i. e. ^{أَن} ^{وَأَن} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{مِّمَّا} ^{أَن} ^{يَكْتُبَ}, meaning *Verily Zaid is (created) of a matter, (namely) writing*, ^{أَن} being i. q. ^{شَيْءٍ}, and ^{أَن} and its *conj.* in the position of a *gen.* as a *subst.* for it, and the sense being the same as in ^{خُلِقَ الْإِنْسَانُ مِنْ عَجَلٍ} XXI.

38. *Man was created of hastiness*, where *man*, because of the *frequency* of his *hastiness*, is declared to have been as it were *created* of it: (b) made to imply the sense of the *p.*, being (a) *interrog.*, the meaning of which is ^{أَيُّ شَيْءٍ} ^{يَبِينُ لَنَا مَا هِيَ} II. 63. *He will explain*

to us what she is, ^{يَبِينُ لَنَا مَا لَوْنُهَا} II. 64. *He will explain to us what her color is*, and ^{وَمَا تَلَكَ بِيَمِينِكَ} XX.

18. *And what is that* [186] *in thy right hand?* (ML): the *interrog.* ^{مَا} sometimes implies the meaning of (α) *contempt*, as

^{يَا زَبْرَقَانُ أَخَا بَنِي خَلَفٍ * مَا أَنتَ وَبَيْبُ أَبِيكَ وَالْفَخْرُ}

[by AlMukhabbal asSa'di, *O Zibriḳān, brother of the Banū Khalaf, what thing art thou (woe to thy father!)*

and glory? (AAz)]; (β) *magnification*, as ^{يَا سَيِّدَا النَّحْ}

[85] and LXIX. 1. 2. [27]; (γ) *disapproval*, as ^{فِيمَ أَنتَ}

LXXIX. 43. *What [181] hast thou to do with the mention of the time of it?, i. e. Do not thou mention it according to one of the interpretations (R): (b) cond., (α) not temporal, as II. 193. [419], II. 100. [499], and, as allowed by some, XVI. 55. And whatever prosperity (is) with you etc. [32], orig. رَمَا يَكُنْ بِكُمْ , the v. of the condition being afterwards suppressed, as in*

إِنْ الْعَقْلُ فِي أَمْوَالِنَا لَا نَضِقُ بِهَا
نِزَاعًا وَإِنْ صَبَرْنَا فَنَصْبِرُ لِلصَّبْرِ

[by Hudba Ibn AlKhashram al'Udhri, *If the price of blood (be) among our goods, we shall not be too straitened to pay it (the دِيَّةُ), and, if (we be confined) with confinement, we shall be patient of the confinement (Jsh), i. e. إِنْ يَكُنِ الْعَقْلُ , like V. 96. (419) (DM.), i. e. إِنْ يَكُنِ الْعَقْلُ and وَإِنْ صَبَرْنَا [an exposition of وَانْ نَحْبِسُ حَبْسًا , because الصَّبْرُ means الْحَبْسُ (DM)]; β) temporal, which is authorized by F, AB, ASH, IBr, and IM, and is obvious in IX. 7. Then, whenever they are upright towards you as touching the covenant, be ye upright towards them as touching the fulfilment, i. e. Be ye upright towards them during the period of their uprightness towards you, and is admissible in IV. 28. [Then*

whatever time ye enjoy them in, give ye them their dowers, بَ being i. q. فَيَ , and the ^أمِنْ in ^{وَهُنَّ} مِنْهُنَّ i. q. the ب (DM), except that this مَ is an *inch.*, not adverbial, [contrary to the one preceding (DM),] and in وَمَا تَكُ يَا ابْنُ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ فِينَا * فَلَا ظَلَمًا نَخَافُ وَلَا أَفْتَقَارًا (ML), by AlFarazdak, *And, whenever thou art, O son of 'Abd Allāh, among us, neither wrong shall we fear, nor want* (Dw). The مَ that follows the *indet.* to import *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness* is said by some to be a *n.*; so that II. 24. [565] means مَثَلًا أَيْ مِثْلُ *A parable, what a parable!* : and the import of this مَ is (1) *contempt*, as مَا هَلْ أُعْطِيتَ إِلَّا عَطِيَّةً مَا Hast thou given aught save some paltry gift? ; (b) *magnification*, as مَا جَدَعَ قَصِيرَ أَنْفِهِ لَأَمْرٍ مَا جَدَعَ قَصِيرَ أَنْفِهِ To some purpose did Kaṣīr cut off his nose and لَأَمْرٍ مَا يَسُودُ الْخ [122]; (c) *modification*, as اضْرِبْهُ ضَرْبًا مَا Beat thou him with some beating, i. e. with one of its modes, whichever of them it be : and these meanings are all combined in *vagueness* and *corroboration of indeterminateness*, i. e. a gift that is not known from its paltriness and a purpose that is not known from its greatness and an unknown, unspecified beating (R). مَا denotes (1) [mostly (R, IA)] the *irrational* (R, IA, Sh), as XVI. 98. [2] (Sh); (2) sometimes the *rational*, as لَنَا سُبْحَانَ مَا سَخَّرَكُنَا لَنَا Extolled be the perfection of Him

Who hath subjected you unto us! and سُبْحَانَ مَا سَبَّحَ Extolled be the perfection of Him in praise of Whom [the hearer of (K on XIII. 14.)] the thunder exclaims "Extolled be God's perfection"! (R, IA), both transmitted by AZ (R), and فَانْكُحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنْ النِّسَاءِ مِثْنَى وَثَلَاثَ وَرُبَاعَ IV. 3. Marry ye what women please you, two each, and three each, and four each (IA); (3) often also the qualities of the rational, as زَيْدٌ مَا هُوَ Zaid, what is he?, which is a question as to his quality, the reply being عَلِيمٌ Learned or something else [556]; (4) sometimes the unknown in quiddity and essence, as مَا هَذَا أَفَرَسٌ أَمْ بَقْرَةٌ أَمْ إِنْسَانٌ What is this, a horse, or an ox, or a man?: and the saying of Pharoah مَا رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ XXVI. 22. And what is the Lord of the worlds? may be a question as to the quality, for which reason Moses says رَبُّ السَّمَوَاتِ XXVI. 23. The Lord of the heavens; or as to the quiddity, but Moses answers by explaining the qualities, not the quiddity, as a warning to Pharoah that He is not known save by His qualities, His quiddity being unknown to man: and their sayings سُبْحَانَ الْخ and سُبْحَانَ الْخ [above] may be because God is unknown in quiddity (R).

§ 181. Its *l* is subject to conversion and elision. The conversion is in (1) the *interrog.*, as in the tradition

of Abū Dhu'aib "I arrived at AlMadīna, when its inhabitants were making an outcry through weeping, like the outcry of the pilgrims when they shout ^{لَبَّيْكَ} at entering the Sacred Territory: so I said ^{مَا} *What?*, [meaning ^{مَا الْخَبَرُ} or ^{مَا الْأَمْرُ} *What (is the news or the matter)?* (IY)] ; and it was said, The Apostle of God has perished," [and in ^{قَدْ وَرَدَتْ النَّحْ} (175, 690), i. e. ^{فَمَا أَصْنَعُ} or ^{فَمَا قُدْرَتِي} *What (is my power)?* (IY)]: (2) the *cond.*, when the *red.* ^{مَا} is affixed to it, [so that they say ^{مَهْمَا} (IY),] as VII. 129. [419] (M). ^{مَهْمَا} is a *n.*, because the *pron.* relates to it in VII. 129: but Suh asserts that it occurs as a *p.* on the evidence of ^{وَمَهْمَا} *And, if any disposition be in a man, though etc* [499], where, says he, it is a *p.* i. q. ^{إِنْ} *If*; and he is followed by IYn, who cites ^{مَهْمَا تُصَبِّ النَّحْ} [22]. Some say that ^{مَهْمَا} is an *adv.* of time, [i. q. ^{مَتِيْمَا} *Whenever* (K on VII. 129.),] and that the sense is ^{أَيَّ رَقَّتِ تُصَبِّ بَارِقًا} *in whatever time they find a cloud charged with lightning from a border of the horizon*, the sentence being transposed; or ^{فِي أَفَقٍ بَارِقًا} *in a border of the horizon a cloud etc*, ^{مِنْ} being *red.* and ^{أَفَقًا} used as an *adv.*: but it will be shown that ^{مَهْمَا} is not used as an *adv.* (ML.)

It is, (1) according to Khl, *orig.* [the *cond.*] مَا ; while, [the *red.*] مَا being sometimes added to *cond.* words [565], as مَا مَتَى and مَا أَتَى , they add مَا to مَا , as they add مَا to مَتَى , so that it becomes مَا مَا ; and then, deeming this expression inelegant because of the repetition of the 2 words, they substitute a ڤ for the 1st ل , saying مَهْمَا , since the ل and ڤ are from one outlet [732]: (2) as others say, compounded of مة i. q. أَكْفَ [187] and the *cond.* مَا , the sense, according to them, being *Abstain thou (from everything): whatever (thou dost I will do)*: (3) as others say, a simple *n.*, whose meaning is *generality*, because, say they, the *o.f.* is absence of composition. The 1st saying is confirmed by the *pron.*'s relating to مَهْمَا , as it relates to مَا , as in VII. 129.; and the 2nd by the saying of the poet

أَمَارِي مَهْمَى يَسْتَمِعُ فِي صَدِيقَةٍ
أَقَاوِيلَ هَذَا النَّاسِ مَارِي يَنْدَمُ

O Māwīya, whoso hearkens to the speeches of this people about his friend, Māwīya, will repent, since he compounds مة with مَنْ , as you compound it with مَا (IY). It is simple, not compounded of مة and the cond. مَا , [as though مَا كَفَّ were said (K), though the sense of مة would not necessarily remain, because another meaning

might be produced by the composition (DM)] ; nor of the *cond.* مَ and *red.* مَ , the 8 being afterwards substituted for the 1st 1 to avoid the repetition. And it has three meanings, (1) *what is irrational, other than time, together with* the implied sense of *condition*, whence the text [VII. 129. (DM)], for which reason it is expounded by مِنْ آيَةٍ [499]: here it is either an *inch.* or an *acc.* by distraction ; and in the latter case a *trans. op.* is supplied for it, as in زَيْدًا مَرَرْتُ بِهِ [62], posterior to it, because it takes the head [of the sentence], i. e. مَهْمَا تَحْضُرُنَا تَاتِنَا بِهِ *Whatsoever sign (thou present to us), thou bring it unto us*: (2) *time and condition*, in which case it is an *adv.* to the *v.* of the *condition*: this is mentioned by IM, who asserts that the GG neglect it, and cites

وَأَنْتَ مَهْمَا تَعْطِ بَطْنَكَ سَوَادَهُ
وَفَرَجَكَ نَالًا مِنْتَهُيَ النَّفْسَ أَجْمَعًا

by Hātim [atṬā'ī, *And verily, whenever thou givest thy belly its craving, and thy penis, they will get the extreme of blame, all of it* (DM)], and other verses ; but there is no evidence in that, because it may denote the *inf. n.*, [in which case it is of the 1st kind, because the *inf. n.* belongs to *what is irrational, other than time* (DM),] in the sense of [however, i. e.] *with whatever giving, much or little*: and in this saying [that مَهْمَا denotes

time and condition (DM)] IM has been anticipated by others; but Z [in the K on VII. 129.] severely reproaches those who say it, and it is impossible in the text, even if it were correctly affirmable elsewhere, because مَهْمَا is expounded by مِنْ آيَةٍ (3) *interrogation*: this is mentioned by many, IM being among them, who cite مَهْمَا لِي اللَّيْلَةُ الْآخِرَةُ [503]; but there is no evidence in the verse, because مَا may be a verbal n. i. q. أَكْفَ [in which case its conjunction in writing is for the sake of puzzling (DM),] and مَا alone an inceptive interrogation, *Hold! what etc?* (ML). The elision is in the *interrog.* when the *preps.* are prefixed to it (M). The I of the *interrog.* مَا is [necessarily (ML)] elided when it is governed in the *gen.* (R, ML) by a *prep.* or *pre. n.* [615]; though sometimes the I occurs expressed, as

عَلَى مَا قَامَ يَشْتُمُنِي لَتِيمٌ * كَخَنَزِيرٍ تَهَرَّغَ فِي دِمَائِي

[below] (R), by Ḥassān Ibn AlMundhir, *For what has a low fellow stood up reviling me, like a hog that has wallowed in ashes?* (Jsh): and the Fatha [is necessarily (DM)] retained as an indication of it, as

فَتَلَكَ وَلَاءُ الْأَسْوَدِ قَدْ طَالَ مَكْتُهُمْ
فَحَتَامٌ حَتَامٌ الْعَذَاءُ الْمَطُولُ

[by AlKumait Ibn Zaid alAsadi, *Then those are the rulers of evil. Their abiding (amongst us) has become long: then until what (time), until what (time) shall the*

lengthened weariness (of them) be? (Jsh)]; though sometimes the Fatha follows it in elision, which is peculiar to poetry, as

يَا أَبَا الْأَسْوَدِ لِمَ خَلَفْتَنِي * لِهَمُومٍ طَارِقَاتٍ وَذِكْرٍ

[*O Abu-l-Aswad, wherefore hast thou left me behind thee to nightly-haunting griefs and memories?* (Jsh)].

The *l*, being elided to distinguish between interrogation and enunciation, is elided in such as LXXIX. 43. [180],

لِمَ تَقُولُونَ مَا لَا تَفْعَلُونَ XXVII. 35. *And shall see with what the messengers will return, and*

LXI. 2. *Wherefore say ye what ye do not?*; but expressed

in لِمَسَّكُمْ فِيمَا أَفَضْتُمْ فِيهِ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ XXIV. 14. *A great chastisement would have befallen you for that slander*

which ye plunged into, يَوْمَنُونَ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ II. 3.

[*Who*] *believe in what hath been revealed unto thee, and*

XXXVIII. 75. مَا مَنَعَكَ أَنْ تَسْجُدَ لِمَا خَلَقْتَ بِيَدَيَّ

What hindered thee from doing obeisance unto what I

created with My two hands? : and, as the *l* is not elided

in enunciation, so is it not expressed in interrogation, the

reading of [Abū 'Abd Allāh (Nw, IKhn, DM)] 'Ikrima

[Ibn 'Abd Allāh (IKhn) alHāshimī alMada'ni (Nw),

the freedman of {'Abd Allāh (IKhn)} Ibn 'Abbās (Nw,

IKhn, DM)] and 'Isā [Ibn 'Umar (K, DM) alAsadī, the

Kūfī Reader, known as AlHamdānī (DM),] عَمَّا يَتَسَاءَلُونَ

LXXVIII. 1. [below] being extraordinary, and the say-

ing of Ḥassān عَلَى مَا قَامَ النَّحْصُ [above] being a poetic license, as likewise is the saying

إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا بِقَتْلَانَا سِرَاتِكُمْ * أَهْلَ الْمَوَارِءِ فَنِيمَا يَكْثُرُ الْقَتْلُ

[*Verily we have slain for our slain your chiefs, (O) people of the standard: then for what (thing) does slaughter abound (among the common people)? (DM)*];

while the ordinary reading may not be attributed to that, because of its weakness, for which reason Ks refutes the saying of the commentators that مَا in يَا لَيْتَ قَوْمِي

is interrog., whereas it is infinitival [571], that my Lord hath etc!; and the wonder is that Z should allow it to be interrog. [in this text] notwithstanding his refutation

of the saying that in فِيمَا أَغْرَيْتَنِي VII. 15. *Then forasmuch as Thou hast made me to err the sense is Then wherefore hast Thou made etc?* by the argument that expression of the ! [when the prep. is prefixed to the interrog. مَا (K)] is rare, anomalous. When, however,

the interrog. مَا is compounded with ذَا, its ! is not elided, as لَمَّا ذَا جِئْتَ [186], because its ! then becomes medial (ML). كَلَّمَ [117, 204, 571]

ought to be written conjoined when it is i. q. كُلُّ رَقَّتْ,

follow either of them except after their conjunction with مَا : but نَعَمًا and بِئْسَمَا [180. 471] are allowed to be written disjoined and conjoined, except that conjunction is preferable in نَعَمًا, because of the concurrence of two similar letters, contrary to مَا بِئْسَى : and, when مَا is affixed to فِي, then, if it be *interrog.*, its ة is elided, and فِيمَ رَغِبْتَ *For what wishedst thou?* is written [conjoined]; whereas, if it be i. q. الَّذِي, you conjoin, but express its ة, writing رَغِبْتَ فِيمَا رَغِبْتَ *I wished for what thou wishedst:* and you write عَمَا conjoined, as in XXIII. 42. [508, 565]; unless it be *interrog.*, as in عَمَّ يَتَسَاءَلُونَ LXXVIII. 1. *Of what question they among themselves?* [above], in which case it is written [conjoined, but] with elision of the ة (D).

§ 182. مَنْ is (1) *cond.*, as IV. 122. [419] : (2) *interrog.*, as مَنْ بَعَثَنَا مِنْ مَرْقَدِنَا XXXVI. 52. *Who hath roused us from our sleep?* and فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمَا يَا مُوسَى XX. 51. *Then who is your Lord, O Moses?* : (a) when مَنْ يَفْعَلُ هَذَا إِلَّا زَيْدٌ *Who does this save Zaid?* is said, it is the *interrog.* مَنْ imbued with the sense of *negation*, whence وَمَنْ يَغْفِرُ الذُّنُوبَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ III. 129. *And who*

forgiveth sins save God ? ; nor is the allowability of that [imbuing of the *interrog.* with *negation* (DM)] restricted to its being preceded by the و, contrary to the opinion of IM, [whose language in the Tashīl, however, only imports that it is *often* preceded by the و (DM),] as is proved by مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِنْدَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ II. 256.

Who is he that shall intercede with Him save by His permission ?: (b) when مَنْ ذَا لَقِيتَ *Who is he (that) thou didst, or Whom didst thou, meet ?* is said, مَنْ is an *inch.*, and ذَا an *enunc.*, a conjunct [186], the *rel.* being suppressed, [i.e. لَقِيتَهُ (DM)] ; or, according to the saying of the KK on the redundancy of *ns.*, ذَا may be *red.*, and مَنْ an *obj.*; while many appear to say that مَنْ and ذَا may be compounded [into one *interrog. n.*, either (a) an *inch.*, the *prop.* لَقِيتَ, i.e. لَقِيتَهُ, being an *enunc.*, or (b) a *prepos. obj.* to لَقِيتَ (DM)], as in مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ [186]:

(3) conjunct, as أَلَمْ تَرَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَسْجُدُ لَهُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَمَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ XXII. 18. *Hast thou not considered that they that are in the heavens and they that are in the earth bow down unto God ?*: (4) a qualified *indet.*, for which reason it (a) has رَبَّ prefixed to it in

رَبِّ مَنْ أَنْصَبْتَ غَيْظًا قَلْبَهُ * قَدْ تَمَنَّى لِي مَوْتًا لَمْ يُطْعَمْ

[by Suwaid Ibn Abi Kāhil alYashkurī, *Many a person whose heart I made to boil with rage did wish for me death, not, i.e. without, being gratified ! (Jsh)*]; (b) is qualified by the *indet.* in such as مَرَرْتُ بِمَنْ مَعْجِبٍ لَكَ فَكَفَى بِنَا الْغَمَّ [147], *I passed by a person pleasing to thee* [503], and

أَنِي وَإِيَّاكَ أَنْ حَلَّتْ بِأَرْحَلِنَا
كَمَنْ بَوَادِيَةٍ بَعْدَ الْمَحَلِّ مُمْطَوْرٍ

by AlFarazdaq, [*Verily I and thou, when they (the she-camels) have stopped at our abodes, shall be like a person rained upon in his valley after drought (DM)*], i.e.

مِنْ : كَشَخْصٍ مُمْطَوْرٍ : (a) in II. 7. [499] many decide that

is qualified, which is improbable from the rarity of this usage ; and others that it is conjunct : while Z says that,

if أَلْ in النَّاسِ be construed to denote *knowledge*,

is conjunct, *And of the men are they that say*, like وَمِنْهُمْ

IX. 61. *And of them are they that*

vex the Prophet, and, if *genus*,

is qualified, [as though وَمِنْ النَّاسِ نَاسٌ يَقُولُونَ *And of men are men that say*

were said (K),] like XXXIII. مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ رِجَالٌ صَدَقُوا

23. *Of believers are men that have fulfilled* ; but this

needs consideration. Two other kinds of

(1) a complete *indet.*, according to F, who says it of [the 2nd

وَنَعْمَ مَرْكَأٌ مِّنْ ضَاكَّتْ مَذَاهِبُهُ * وَنَعْمَ مَن هُوَ فِي سِرٍّ وَأَعْلَانٍ

[by AlFarazdak, *And most excellent is the refuge of him whose ways to a livelihood have become strait, and most excellent is he as a person, he in privacy and publicity!* (Jsh)], asserting that the *ag.* is latent, مِّنْ a *sp.*, and هُوَ particularized by praise [469]; while others say that مِّنْ is conjunct, an *ag.*, هُوَ an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is another هُوَ suppressed, upon the principle of وَشِعْرِيّ [30], [the *prop.* being the *conj.* of مِّنْ (DM),] and the *adv.* [498] dependent upon the suppressed [هُوَ], because it contains the sense of the *v.*, i.e. وَنَعْمَ مَن هُوَ الثَّابِتُ and most excellent is he that is (he, i. e. the steadfast) in etc., in which case I say that a 3rd هُوَ he particularized by praise must be supplied: (2) a *corrob.* [563], vid. [in the positions (DM)] where Ks asserts that it occurs *red.*, like مَا, that being easy according to the rule of the KK that *ns.* are made *red.*, whence فَكَفَىٰ بِنَا آلَخ [above] over others than us, the version

يَا شَاةَ مَن قَنَصٍ لِّمَن حَاتَ لَهُ * حَرَمَتْ عَلَىٰ وَلِيِّهَا لَمْ تَحْرَمِ

[by 'Antara, *O (people, behold a) wild cow (a met. for woman) of the chase for him that she has become lawful unto, (and marvel at her beauty and her comeliness)! She*

has become unlawful unto me, and would that she had not become unlawful ! (EM)], and the saying

أَلِ الزَّبِيرِ سَنَامُ الْمَجْدِ قَدْ عَلِمَتْ
ذَاكَ الْقَبَائِلَ وَالْأَثَرُونَ مِنْ عَدَدَا

(ML) *The family of Az Zubair Ibn Al'Awwām are the summit of glory (the tribes of the Arabs have known that), and are the most multitudinous in number (Jsh).*

مِنْ [mostly (IA)] denotes the rational (R, IA, Sh), as

أَفَمَنْ يَعْلَمُ إِنَّمَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنَ رَبِّكَ الْحَقَّ كَمَنْ هُوَ أَعْمَى

XIII. 19. *What! then is he that knoweth that what hath been revealed to thee from thy Lord is the truth like him that is blind? (Sh) ; but sometimes the irra-*

tional, as وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ يَمْشِي عَلَى أَرْبَعٍ XXIV. 44. *And of them is what goeth upon four legs (R, IA), whence*

أَسْرَبَ الْقَطَا هَلْ مِنْ يَعْبُرُ جَنَاحَهُ
لَعَالَى إِلَى مَنْ قَدْ هَوِيَتْ أَصْلَابُهُ

(IA), by Al'Abbās Ibn AlAḥnaf, *O flock of Kātā, is he that will lend (me) his wing (present among you)? Perhaps I shall fly (with it) to her that I have loved (J).*

مِنْ [as also مَا (R)] is literally *sing. masc.*; but is applied to the [*sing. (M), du., and pl., [masc. (M)] and fem. :* and, [if the *du., pl., or fem.* be meant by them (R),] the letter is oftener observed (M, R) in what they are expressed by, vid. the *pron., dem., and the like (R), but*

sometimes the sense, as ^{وَمَنْ يَقْنُتْ} ^{لِلَّهِ} ^{وَرَسُولِهِ} ^{وَمَنْ يَقْنُتْ} ^{لِلَّهِ} ^{وَرَسُولِهِ} XXXIII. 31. *And whosoever of you is obedient to God and His Apostle, and doeth good read* with masculinization of the 1st and femininization of the 2nd, X. 43. [581], and

تَعَشَّ فَإِنْ عَاهَدْتَنِي لَا تَخُونَنِي
نَكُنْ مِثْلَ مَنْ يَأْذُبُ يَصْطَحِبَانِ

by AlFarazdaq (M), *Sup thou, for, if thou covenant with me that thou wilt not deal, or not dealing, treacherously with me, we shall be like the two, O wolf, that keep company together* (Jsh); and hence the saying of the Arabs, as Y tells us, ^{مَنْ كَانَتْ أُمُّكَ} ^{مَنْ كَانَتْ أُمُّكَ} ^{مَنْ كَانَتْ أُمُّكَ} *Who was thy mother?*

[171, 449, 474], while Khl asserts that some read ^{وَمَنْ} ^{وَمَنْ} ^{وَمَنْ} (S). Observance of the letter is better than observance of the sense, because the letter is nearer to that expression made to accord with ^{مَنْ} or ^{مَا} than the sense, since it is a means to the sense; but, if the expression made to accord with ^{مَنْ} or ^{مَا} be preceded by what aids the sense, observance of the sense is preferred: and therefore the Readers do not differ in the masculinization of ^{وَمَنْ يَقْنُتْ} ^{وَمَنْ يَقْنُتْ} ^{وَمَنْ يَقْنُتْ} and ^{مَنْ يَأْتِ} ^{مَنْ يَأْتِ} ^{مَنْ يَأْتِ} XXXIII. 30. *Whosoever of you committeth*; contrary to ^{وَتَعْمَلُ} ^{وَتَعْمَلُ} ^{وَتَعْمَلُ}, because the latter comes after ^{مَنْ} ^{مَنْ} ^{مَنْ}, which is an aid to the sense, for

which reason ^{نُؤْتِيهَا أَجْرَهَا} *We will give her her reward* is then said : and, if ambiguity would be produced by observance of the letter, observance of the sense is necessary ; so that you do not say ^{لَقَيْتُ مِنْ أَحِبِّهِ} *لَقَيْتُ* when you mean a *woman*, unless some [explanatory] context be there. And, because observance of the letter is more frequent and better than observance of the sense, precdence of observance of the letter, when the two observances are combined, is more frequent than the reverse : the text says ^{وَمَنْ يُؤْمِنْ بِاللَّهِ وَيَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا يُدْخِلْهُ جَنَّاتٍ} *وَمَنْ يُؤْمِنْ بِاللَّهِ وَيَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا يُدْخِلْهُ جَنَّاتٍ* LXV. 11. *And whoso believeth in God, and doeth good, him will He make to enter gardens beneath the trees of which flow streams by concord with the letter, and afterwards* ^{خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا} *خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا* *about to abide therein for ever by concord with the sense; and, for the same reason, vid. that concord with the letter is better, it reverts after* ^{خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا} *خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا* *to concord with the letter, saying* ^{قَدْ أَحْسَنَ اللَّهُ لَهُ رِزْقًا} *قَدْ أَحْسَنَ اللَّهُ لَهُ رِزْقًا* *God hath made goodly provision for him! (R).* ^{مِنْ} *مِنْ*, when attached to ^{كُلٌّ} *كُلٌّ* or ^{مَعٌ} *مَعٌ*, is written disjoined ; and is written conjoined only in ^{عَمِنْ} *عَمِنْ* and ^{مَعْمِنْ} *مَعْمِنْ*, on account of the incorporation of the ^ن *ن* into the ^م *م*, as in ^{عَمَّا} [181] and ^{أَمَّا} [589] (D).

§ 183. When you interrogate with مَنْ about a mentioned rational [185] *indet.*, and pause upon مَنْ [185], (1) you may imitate in مَنْ the inflection of that mentioned [*indet.*] and the signs of its *du.*, *pl.*, and *fem.* : thus you say مَنْو [497], مَنْا, and مَنْى when رَأَيْتُ جَاؤَنِى رَجُلٌ, رَأَيْتُ جَاؤُنِى رَجُلًا, and مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ are said ; مَنْان and مَنْين when مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلَيْنِ, رَأَيْتُ رَجُلَيْنِ, جَاؤَنِى رَجُلَانِ, and مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلَيْنِ are said ; مَنْون when جَاؤَنِى مُسْلِمُونَ or رَجَالٌ or قَوْمٌ is said, and مَنْين in the *acc.* and *gen.* ; مَنْه when جَاؤَتْنِى ضَارِبَةٌ or جَاؤَتْنِى ضَارِبَتَانِ [268] is said, and likewise in the *acc.* and *gen.* ; مَنْتين when جَاؤَتْنِى ضَارِبَتَانِ or ضَالِقَانِ is said, and مَنْتين in the *acc.* and *gen.* ; and مَنْات when جَاؤَتْنِى مُسْلِمَاتٌ or ضَوَارِبٌ is said, and likewise in the *acc.* and *gen.* : (a) they add in the *sing. masc.* the و, ا, and ي instead of the vowels, because, if they imitated the vowels of the *indet.* as they are, the word would be vocalized in pause, which is not allowable ; so that instead of the vowels they express quiescent consonants resembling them, and put before the consonants vowels akin to them : this is the opinion of Mb ; but Sf says that they express the vowels in مَنْ for imitation of the inflection, as in اِى [185], and

that, since the state is that of pause, and the final of the word paused upon is quiescent, they then implete the vowels, so that the consonants are engendered : and both the sayings are possible : (b) expression of the letters of prolongation indicative of the inflection not being possible in مَنَّةٌ, since the ّ of femininization in pause is only quiescent, they content themselves with imitating the sign of the *fem.*, and omit to imitate the inflection ; and they treat مَنَاتٌ like its *sing.* in omitting to imitate its inflection, although it would be possible by putting the letters of prolongation : (c) the quiescence of the [1st] ن in مَنَاتٌ and مَنَتِي is a warning that the ت denotes femininization not of the word that it is affixed to, but of another word ; for which reason in what precedes it they do not keep to the mobility inseparable from what precedes the ّ of femininization : and the ن in the *sing.* is sometimes made quiescent, as مَنَتٌ ; though it is oftener mobilized, because they add the ّ to indicate that the question is about a *fem.*, and the fact that the ّ is preceded by Fath and converted into ّ in pause is more indicative of its denoting femininization, such as مَنَتٌ and مَنَتٌ and such as

مَا بَالُ عَيْنِي عَنْ كَرَاهَا قَدْ جَفَتْ
مَسْبَلَةٌ تَسْتَنِي لَمَّا عَرَفْتُ

دَارًا لِسَلْمَى بَعْدَ حَوْلٍ قَدْ عَفَتْ
بَلْ جَوْزٌ تَبِيْهَاءُ كَظَاهِرِ الْحَبَجَفَتِ

[What is the state of mine eye? From its drowsiness it has started, shedding tears, pouring forth water, since it has recognized after a year a dwelling of Salma's that has become effaced: nay, a middle of a desert like the back of the buckler (in its ascent and descent)!, or Nay, (many) a middle etc (does mine eye weep when it sees, because of its having been an abode of Salma's in by-gone days and past nights)! (AAz)] being rare: but such as ^{مَنْتَانِ} sometimes occurs with the ^ن that is before the ^م mobilized: (2) you may add to ^{مِنْ} the letters of prolongation and softness, as we mentioned in the 1st method in the *sing. masc.*, imitating the inflection only, and not the signs of the *du., pl., and fem.*, even though you question about them, by treating ^{مِنْ} according to its general rule of being uniformly applicable to all [numbers and genders]: thus, when ^{رَجُلٍ} or ^{جَاءَنِي رَجُلٌ} or ^{رَجُلَانِ} or ^{رِجَالٌ} or ^{أَمْرَأَةً} or ^{أَمْرَأَتَانِ} or ^{نِسْوَةً} is said, you say ^{مِنْو}; and analogously in the *acc. and gen.*: (3) you may put ^{مِنْ} alone in every state without imitation of the inflection or other signs, as in the state of continuity. Y allows imitation with ^{مِنْ} in continuity by analogy to ^{أَيَّ} [185], saying ^{مِنْ يَأْتَنِي}: ^{مِنْ يَأْتَنِي} and ^{مِنْ يَأْتَنِي}: and attributes to it the

saying of the poet [AlFarazdak, or, as some say (N), Sumair Ibn AlHārith adDabbī (AAz, N),]

اترا نارى فقلت منون انتم * فقالوا الجن قلت عموا ظلما

[They came to my fire, and I said, Who are ye? And they said, The Jinn. I said, May your life be pleasant in darkness! (AAz, N)]. And Y relates that ضَرْبٌ مِنْ

مَنْ Who beat whom? has been heard in interrogation about the beater and beaten: but this, as S says, is improbable; and, as Y also says, is not accepted by every one, because the *v.* precedes the *interrog.* word: and, as for the inflection of the *interrog.*, it is said to be an imitation, as though the speaker had heard a man say ضَرْبٌ رَجُلٍ رَجُلًا; whereas the fact appears to be that it is not an imita-

tion, but that in some *dials.* مَنْ may be *infl.* not by way of imitation, as you see in مَنْون انتم, which is not imitated as Y asserts, since there is no *indet.* mentioned before it.

The signs mentioned are not affixed to مَنْ except at the end of the sentence, because they are in the state of pause; so that, when امراة رَجُلًا و امراة or رَجُلًا و امراة and امراة رَجُلًا و امراة are said, you say مَنْ و مَنَّة or مَنْ و مَنَّة and مَنْ و مَنَّة, and so on. When the rational and irrational are combined, you put the question about the rational with مَنْ, and about the irrational with مَنْ, and

as ^{لَقِيْتُ رَجُلًا} ^{مَنْ} ^{وَأَيُّهَا} *Whom and which two?* when ^{وَحَمَارَيْنِ} is said. *Dets.* after ^{مَنْ} are (1) not proper names, in which case there are three methods:—(a) most commonly there is no imitation in them, nor in ^{مَنْ} after their suppression; (b) Mb transmits from Y that they are mentioned after ^{مَنْ} imitated, like proper names [below], so that, when a man says ^{رَأَيْتُ أَخَا زَيْدٍ}, you say ^{مَنْ} ^{أَخَا زَيْدٍ}, which S allows, though not as matter of choice, but like ^{دَعَانَا} ^{مَنْ} [1, 185] and ^{لَيْسَ بِقُرْشِيًّا}; (c) they are suppressed, while the signs of imitation are expressed in ^{مَنْ}, as in the case of *indets.*, because the *det.* mentioned is unknown to the hearer, like the *indet.*, as S relates that, when ^{مَعْ مَنِينِ} ^{قَدْ رَأَيْتَهُ} and ^{ذَهَبَتْ مَعَهُمْ} are said, ^{مَنْ} and ^{مَنْ} are said: (2) proper names, in which case there are two methods:—(a) the people of AlHijāz imitate the proper name after ^{مَنْ} upon certain conditions: (a) the [proper name] questioned about must not be qualified, corroborated, or followed by a *subst.* or *synd. expl.*, because the repetition of these *ants.* with their *apposs.* enables the imitation of their inflection to be dispensed with, since the person addressed knows that the person questioned about is the one mentioned, being guided to him by the repetition of the identical *apposs. men-*

tioned ; so that, when ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{الْظَرِيفُ} ^{رَأَيْتَ} ^{زَيْدًا} or ^{نَفْسَهُ} ^{زَيْدًا} or ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{مِنْ} ^{زَيْدِ} ^{الْظَرِيفِ} is said, you say ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{أَبُو} ^{مُحَمَّدٍ} or ^{نَفْسَهُ} ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{أَبُو} ^{مُحَمَّدٍ} with the *nom.* : though, if it be qualified by ^{أَبْنِ} ^{أَبْنِ}, and its Tanwīn be dropped, imitation of it is not disallowed according to the people of AlHijāz, because this qualified with this *qual.* is treated like one *n.*, as is proved by the elision of the Tanwīn from the qualified [609] and by the qualified's being governed in the *acc.* in the *voc.* [50] ; so that, when ^{رَأَيْتَ} ^{زَيْدَ} ^{بْنِ} ^{عُمَرَ} is said, you say ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{بْنِ} ^{عُمَرَ} with the *acc.* ; whereas, if ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{أَبْنِ} ^{أَخِي} ^{عُمَرَ} be said, you say ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{أَبْنِ} ^{أَخِي} ^{عُمَرَ} with the *nom.* : (b) the coupled without repetition of ^{مِنْ} is like the rest of the *appos.*, according to Y, as respects disallowance of imitation with it, whether both be proper names or one of them : but S transmits from some people (and approves of it) that imitation is allowable when the *ant.* is a proper name, whether the coupled be a proper name or not, as ^{زَيْدًا} ^{وَعُمَرًا} or ^{زَيْدًا} ^{وَأَخَاهُ} ^{عُمَرَ} when ^{لَقِيتُ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{وَعُمَرًا} or ^{زَيْدًا} ^{وَأَخَاهُ} ^{عُمَرَ} is said, the question being put with the single [*ant.*] *n.*, which is then coupled to after the imitation ; whereas, if the *ant.* be not a proper name, as when ^{مَرَرْتُ} ^{بِأَخِيكَ} ^{وَزَيْدٍ} is said, imitation is not allowable in the question by com-

mon consent, but the *nom.* is necessary, because the *ant.* may not be imitated, and similarly therefore the *appos.* :

(c) if ^أمَنْ be repeated in the coupled, as ^أمَنْ ^أزَيْدًا ^أوَمَنْ ^أمَنْ, imitation is allowable in the proper name, but not in what is not a proper name, because, the 2nd being plainly disconnected from the 1st, each of the *ant.* and coupled has its own predicament, as though it were alone : (d) a *con.* must not be prefixed to ^أمَنْ, as in ^أفَعْنٍ ^أوَمَنْ ^أزَيْدٍ or ^أزَيْدٍ, where imitation is not allowable by common consent, because of the cessation of ambiguity, since the coupling to the sentence of the person addressed notifies that the question is only about the person mentioned by him : (e) the cognomen may be imitated by common consent; but there is a dispute about the surname, which properly may be imitated, because it also is a proper name [4] ; and similarly the imitation of the *du.* and *pl.* of the proper name is disputed, the allowers looking to its *sing.*, and the disallowers to the cessation of the quality of proper name on account of the dualization and pluralization [171] : (f) when what follows ^أمَنْ is imitated, ^أمَنْ is in the position of a *nom.* by inchoation : and what follows it, if a *nom.*, is so by imitation, not as an *enunc.*, the sign of the *nom.* due to the quality of *enunc.* being supplied in it ; and, if an *acc.* or *gen.*, is in the position of a *nom.* as an *enunc.* ; so that each is an *infl.* [n.]

in the position of a *nom.*, whose inflection [as an *enunc.*] is impossible through the preoccupation of its place by a vowel imported for imitation [185]: (g) suppression of the proper name after ^أمَنْ and expression of the sign of imitation in the latter sometimes occur: thus, خَلَفَ دَارَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ *Behind the door of 'Abd Allah* having been said, the hearer said دَارَ مَنْنِي *The house of whom?*: (b) the Banū Tanīm treat the proper name in interrogation about it with ^أمَنْ like other *ns.*, putting it in the *nom.* in every case by inchoation. When you question with ^أمَنْ about a *rel. ep.* of a proper name, then, (1) if the *ep.* relate to what is rational, whether the related proper name be rational or not, as when لَقِيتُ زَيْدًا or رَكِبْتُ رَكْبَتَ [6] is said, you may say أَلْمَنْنِي, meaning, e. g., *The Bakrī or the Kurashī?*: (a) you put ^أمَنْ in place of the *rel. ep.*; and prefix أَلْ to ^أمَنْ, because it would be so in the *rel. ep.* questioned about, e. g. الْبَكْرِي, since the *rel. ep.* of the proper name must contain أَلْ; and affix the ي of relation at the end of ^أمَنْ, as it would be at the end of the *rel. ep.* questioned about; and most commonly prefix the *interrog.* Hamza to أَلْ saying أَلْمَنْنِي with prolongation, because it would be so in the *rel. ep.* questioned about, since

you say ^{قُرَشِي} ^{أَوْ} ^{الْهَاشِمِي} *The Kurashī or the Hāshimī?*,
and also because ^{مِنْ} 's implication of the sense of the
[interrog.] *p.* is weakened by the prefixion of the ^{لِ} of
determination, and affixion of the ^ي of relation, to it ;
while some do not put the Hamza, saying ^{الْمَنِي} abbrevi-
ated, because they content themselves with the *interrog.*
sense in ^{مِنْ} : (b) the inflection of the proper name
whose relationship is questioned about is imitated in
^{الْمَنِي}, whether the questioner continue or pause, just
like the imitation in ^{أَي} [185] ; so that, when ^{جاءَ} ^{زَيْدٌ}
is said, you say ^{الْمَنِي} ^{يَا} ^{فَتَى} *The clansman of whom, O*
youth?, and similarly ^{الْمَنِي}, ^{الْمَنِي}, ^{الْمَنِيَانِ}, ^{الْمَنِيَانِ},
^{الْمَنِيَانِ}, ^{الْمَنِيَانِ}, ^{الْمَنِيَانِ}, ^{الْمَنِيَانِ}, and
^{الْمَنِيَانِ} : (c) the person questioned gives the answer
according to the inflection of ^{الْمَنِي} : so that, when you say
^{رَأَيْتَ} ^{زَيْدًا}, the questioner says ^{الْمَنِي}, and you then say
^{الْقُرَشِي} as *ep.* of the ^{زَيْدًا} mentioned at first in your sen-
tence ; though the *nom.* is allowable in all cases by sub-
audition of an *inch.*, i. e. ^{هُوَ} ^{الْقُرَشِي} (*He is*) *the Kurashī*,
because it is separated from the qualified by the interven-
tion of the interrogation : (2) if the *ep.* relate to what is

irrational, like ^{مَكِّي} *The Meccan* and ^{بَصْرِي} *The Busrī*,
^{مَنِي} *is not allowable by common consent (R).*

§ 184. ^{أَي} *is (1) cond., as XVII. 110. [116, 565]*
and ^{أَيَّمَا} ^{الْأَجْلِيَيْنِ} ^{قَضَيْتُ} ^{فَلَا} ^{عُدَوَانُ} ^{عَلَيَّ} XXVIII. 28.
Whichever [181, 565] of the two terms I fulfil, no in-
justice shall be done upon me, [which is also read ^{أَيَّمَا} *{ with*
quiescence of the ^ي *(K) }, like* ^{تَنْظَرْتُ} ^{أَنْخَ} *(below) (K,*
B)]: (2) interrog., as ^{أَيُّكُمْ} ^{زَادَتْ} ^{هَذِهِ} ^{أَيْمَانًا} IX. 125.
Which of you is such that this Chapter hath increased
him in belief? and ^{فَبِأَيِّ} ^{حَدِيثٍ} ^{بَعْدَهُ} ^{يُؤْمِنُونَ} VII. 184.
Then in what story after it will they believe?; which is
sometimes abbreviated, as

^{تَنْظَرْتُ} ^{نَصْرًا} ^{وَالسَّمَائَيْنِ} ^{أَيُّهُمَا}
^{عَلَى} ^{مِنَ} ^{الْغَيْثِ} ^{اسْتَهْلَتْ} ^{مَوَاطِرَهُ}

[by AlFarazdaq, *I gazed at Naṣr and the two stars named*
Simāk that I might know which of them two was such
that his showers of rain poured plentifully upon me (N)]:
(3) conjunct, as ^{ثُمَّ} ^{لَنَنْزِعَنَّ} ^{مِنْ} ^{كُلِّ} ^{شَيْعَةٍ} ^{أَيُّهُمْ} ^{أَشَدُّ} ^{عَلَى}
^{الْأَرْحَمَنِ} ^{عَتِيًّا} XIX. 70. *Then We will surely drag forth*
from every sect him of them (that) is most hardened in re-
bellion against the Compassionate [176, 177], i. e. ^{أَلْنِي} ^{هُوَ}

أَشَدُّ, says S: (4) indicative of the sense of *perfection*, in which case it occurs as (a) an *ep.* of the *indet.*, as زَيْدٌ رَجُلٌ أَيْ رَجُلٌ *Zaid is a man, what a man!*, i. e. *perfect in the qualities of men*; (b) a *d. s.* to the *det.*, as مَرَرْتُ بِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ أَيْ رَجُلٍ *I passed by 'Abd Allāh, what a man!*; (5) a connective to the vocation of what contains أَلْ, as يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّجُلُ [48, 51, 552]. And Akh adds a [6th (DM)] kind, vid. a qualified *indet.*, as مَرَرْتُ بِأَيٍّ *I passed by a person pleasing to thee (DM)*], like بِمَنْ مَعْجِبٍ لَكَ [182]; but this [kind (DM)] is unheard [147]. أَيْ is not decidedly [i. e. literally and constructively (DM)] aprothetic [116, 176] except in vocation [51] and imitation [185] (ML). أَيْ is *infl.*, alone among conjuncts, subject to the dispute on اللَّذَانِ [176], اللَّتَانِ, and the تَاوِئِ, and alone among *interrogs.* and *conds.*, because of its inseparability from prothesis, which makes the quality of *n.* preponderate: so that, when the *post. n.* is suppressed, then, if it be not supplied, أَيْ is not *infl.*, as in vocation; but, if it be supplied, أَيْ remains *infl.*, as in XVII. 110. [116]; except in كَابِي [226], where it is cut off from prothesis notwithstanding its inflection, because it is like the

uninfl. (R). The *interrog.* or *cond.* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* is *infl.* unrestrictedly, by common consent, as IX. 125. [above], XXVI. 228. [445], and ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* LXVIII. 5. 6. Then thou shalt see, and they shall see, which of you is the demented, the *ب* being red. [503], orig. ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ*, and the *prop.* being [in the place of] an *acc.* by ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* or ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* [1], because they contest it [22], but are suspended from government by the *interrog.* [445] (Sh). The conjunct ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* has four states:—(1) it is *pre.*, and the head of its *conj.* is mentioned, as ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ*; (2) it is not *pre.*, and the head of its *conj.* is not mentioned, as ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ*; (3) it is not *pre.*, and the head of its *conj.* is mentioned, as ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ*; (4) it is *pre.*, and the head of the *conj.* is suppressed, as ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* (IA). The conjunct *أَيُّ* is *infl.* [with the three vowels (IA) in all its states (Sh)] except when it is *pre.* and the head of its *conj.* is a suppressed *pron.*, [in which state it is *uninfl.* upon Damm, as XIX. 70. (IA, Sh), i. e. ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* ^{أَيُّ} *أَيُّ* (Sh), and

إِذَا مَا لَقِيتَ بَنِي مَالِكٍ فَسَلِّمْ عَلَيْهِمْ عَلَى أَهْلِ أَفْضَلٍ

(IA), by Ghassān Ibn 'Ula, *Whenever thou meetest the Banū Malik, salute him of them (that) is most excellent.*

proved upon it either in continuity or in pause, whereas, ^{أَ}مُن being *uninfl.*, they try to keep it away from inflection, and therefore express the signs only in a state where there is mostly no inflection or Tanwīn of declinability upon the word, vid. the state of pause, where the word is divested of the sign of the *nom.* and *gen.* and of the Tanwīn: (2) you may restrict yourself in continuity to inflecting ^{أَ}مُن in the *sing.*, saying ^{أَ}أَي, ^{أَ}أَيَا, and ^{أَ}أَيِي in the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*, *masc.* and *fem.* The vowels affixed to ^{أَ}مُن in the state of imitation are explained as being its inflection, in which case it is an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, an *obj.* whose *v.* is suppressed, or a *gen.* whose *prep.* is understood: but this is weak, because subaudition of the *prep.* is rare, extraordinary [515], while dualization and pluralization of ^{أَ}مُن without imitation are also of weak authority [176]; and it should rather be said, as in the case of ^{أَ}مُن [183], that these signs are imitative alliterations to the speaker's expression, and that the place of both [^{أَ}مُن and ^{أَ}أَي] is that of a *nom.* by inchoation, the full phrase being ^{أَ}مَنْ هُوَ *Who (is he)?* and ^{أَ}أَي رَجُلٌ هُوَ, i. e. ^{أَ}أَي رَجُلٌ هُوَ *What (man is he)?* When you question with ^{أَ}أَي about *dets.*, there is no dispute that what follows it is not imitated; so that, when ^{أَ}أَيُّ زَيْدًا and ^{أَ}أَيُّ بَيْتٍ are said, you say

أَيُّ زَيْدٍ *Who is Zaid?* with the *nom.* only, because, the inflection appearing in أَيُّ, they dislike the 2nd to differ from it, contrary to مَنْ زَيْدًا and مَنْ زَيْدٍ [183]. Some of the Arabs, however, sometimes imitate the *n.*, whether a proper name or not, even without a question, as لَيْسَ بِقُرْشِيًّا دُعَانَا مِنْ تَمْرَتَانِي [1, 183]; and therefore, according to this *dial.*, imitation is allowable when you question with مَنْ or أَيُّ, even without a proper name, as transmitted [by Mb] from Y [183].

§ 186. The KK allow ذَا and the whole of the *dems.* to be conjunct, whether they be after the *interrog.* مَا [or مَنْ] or not, citing as evidence II. 79. [56], i. e. *ye are they that slay yourselves*, عَدَسَى آلَخِ [83], i. e. *and he (that) thou carriest is freed*, and XX. 18. [180], i. e. *what is that (which) is in thy right hand?*; but the BB allow that only in the case of ذَا after the *interrog.* مَا or مَنْ, when ذَا is not *red.*, as it is in II. 246. [411], i. e. *ما الَّذِي*, and in ذَا الَّذِي صَنَعَ, i. e. *ما الَّذِي* *What is that (which) he has done?*, ذَا being *red.* in both positions, since it is followed by a conjunct (R). ذَا is used as a conjunct upon two conditions, (1) that it be preceded by the *interrog.* مَا or مَنْ, [as أَنْزَلَ رَبُّكُمْ] XVI. 26.

What is that which your Lord hath revealed? مَنْ ذَا الَّذِي أُنْزِلَتْ عَلَيْهِ الْوَحْيُ (182), and

وَقَصِيدَةٍ تَأْتِي الْمُلُوكَ غَرِيبَةً * قَدْ قُلْتُهَا لِيُقَالَ مَنْ ذَا قَالَهَا
(Sh) *And many an ode, that comes to kings, marvellous, have I composed, that it might be said, Who is he that composed it?* (Jsh)] : (2) that ذَا be not made otiose by being compounded with مَا [or مَنْ (IA)] into one [interrog. (IA)] n. (IA, Sh), as مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ *What hast thou done?* [182], مَا ذَا being treated as equivalent to أَيُّ شَيْءٍ, so that it is a *prepos. obj.*; whereas, if you construe مَا to be an *inch.*, and ذَا an *enunc.*, ذَا is conjunct, *What is that which thou hast done?* because it is not made otiose (Sh). مَا ذَا occurs in [6 (DM)] several ways:—(1) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا a *dem.*, as in

مَا ذَا الْقَوْفُ عَلَى نَارٍ وَقَدْ خَمِئَتْ
يَا طَالَمَا أَوْقَدْتُ فِي الْحَرْبِ نِيرَانًا

[*What is this standing by a fire of war when it has sunk low? O long have fires been kindled in war!* (Jsh)] : (2) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا conjunct, as in

أَلَا تَسْأَلَانِ الْمَرْءَ مَا ذَا يُحَاوِلُ
أَنْتَحِبُ فَيَقْضَى أَمْ ضَلَالٌ وَبَاطِلٌ

by Labid, [*Will not ye two ask man what is that (which) he is seeking? A vow, so that it may be fulfilled, or error and vanity?* i. e. ^{يُكَارِلُهُ} (Jsh)]; and preferably in the reading [of Abū 'Amr (B)] ^{قُلْ} ^{يَنْفَقُونَ} ^{مَاذَا} ^{يُنْفِقُونَ} ^{قُلْ} II. 216. 217. *And they will ask thee what is that (which) they shall expend. Say thou, (That which they shall expend is) the superfluous,* i. e. ^{يُنْفِقُونَ} ^{الْعَفْوُ}, since the general rule is that the nominal [*prop.* (DM)] should be answered by the nominal, and the verbal by the verbal: (3) ^{مَاذَا} is all of it a *comp. interrog.*, as in ^{لِمَاذَا} ^{جِئْتُ} [181] and

يَا خُزَّرَ تَغْلِبَ مَاذَا بَالُ نِسْوَتِكُمْ
لَا يَسْتَفْقِنُ إِلَى الدِّيَرَيْنِ تَحْنَانًا

[by Jarir, *O small-eyed ones of Taghlib, what is the case of your women? They recover not from longing for the two Convents of the Christians* (Jsh)]; and preferably in the reading of others than Abū 'Amr ^{قُلْ} ^{الْعَفْوُ} II. 217. *what they shall expend. Say thou, (They shall expend) the superfluous,* [because then the answer agrees with the question in being verbal (DM),] i. e. ^{يُنْفِقُونَ} ^{الْعَفْوُ} (4) ^{مَاذَا} is all of it a *n.* [indicative (DM)] of genus, i. q. ^{شَيْءٌ}, or a conjunct [*n.* (DM)], i. q. ^{الَّذِي}, according to different opinions upon the explanation of

دَعِيَ مَا ذَا عَلِمْتُ سَاتِقِيهِ * وَلَكِنْ بِالْمَغِيبِ نَبِّئَنِي

[by AlMuthakḳib al'Abdi, *Leave thou alone a thing (that), or that (which), I have known—I shall guard against it—but acquaint thou me with the hidden, i. e. عَلِمْتُ (Jsh)*], where the majority hold that مَا ذَا is all of it the *obj.* of دَعِيَ, but afterwards differ, Sf and IKh saying that it is a conjunct, i. q. النَّبِي; and F that it is a [qualified (DM)] *indet.*, i. q. شَيْء (5): مَا is *red.*, and ذَا a *dem.*, as in انْزُورَا النَّحْرَ [565], *orig.* سُرْع, where F says that ذَا may be *ag.* of سُرْع, and مَا *red.*; or that مَا ذَا may be all of it a *n.*, as in دَعِيَ النَّحْرَ, [though here it is a *dem.*, and there a conjunct (DM) or *indet.*]: (6) مَا is *interrog.*, and ذَا *red.*, allowed by many, among them IM, in such as مَا ذَا صَنَعْتَ What hast thou done? [above]; but upon this supposition the ا ought to be necessarily elided in such as لَمْ ذَا جِئْتَ [181], and the truth is that *ns.* are not made *red.* (ML). And [there is a 7th way, for] ذَا sometimes occurs *red.* after the conjunct مَا, as دَعِيَ مَا ذَا النَّحْرَ [above] *that (which) I have known* (R).

THE VERBAL NOUNS AND EJAOUATIONS

§ 187. The verbal *n.* is that [*n.* (Jm)] which is in the sense of the *imp.* or *pret.* (IH). It is that [expression (IA)] which acts as a substitute for the *v.* (IM, Fk) in [sense and (IA)] government (IA, A), but which is not impressible by the *ops.* [159], nor superfluous (A, Fk). The 1st restriction excludes the *inf. n.* occurring as a substitute for expression of the *v.*, [as in ^{فَرَبًا زَيْدًا} (41) (Sn),] the *act. part.*, [as in ^{أَقَامَ الزَّيْدَانِ} (24) (Sn),] and the like; and the 2nd excludes the *ps.* (A), like ^{أَفَى} and its sisters [516] (Sn). The verbal *n.* is [of 3 sorts (Sh),] (1) i. q. the *imp.*, most often, [like ^{دَعِ} i. q. ^{بَلِّغْ}, as ^{تَنَزَّلُ الْغَزْمَةُ عَلَيْكَ} (192) in the version with the *acc.*, ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} i. q. ^{الزَّيْمَةُ}, as V. 104. (44), ^{دُونَكُمْ} i. q. ^{خُذْ}, and ^{رَوَيْدَةً} or ^{تَيْدَةً} i. q. ^{أَمَهْلَةً} (Sh)]: (2) i. q. the *pret.*, [more often than the *aor.* (Sh),] like ^{بَعْدَ} i. q. ^{هَيَّاهُتْ}, [as

^{فَهَيَّاهُتْ هَيَّاهُتْ الْعَقِيقُ وَمَنْ بِهِ}
^{وَهَيَّاهُتْ خَلْ بِالْعَقِيقِ نَوَاصِلُهُ}

(Sh), by Jarīr, *Then far, far off* (22) are *Al' Akik* (a place) and *he that is therein!* And *far off* is a friend that in *Al' Akik* we shall be united with! (Jsh),] and ^{اِفْتَرَقْ} i. q. ^{شَتَانِ}, [as

شَتَانُ هَذَا وَالْعَنَاقِ وَالنَّوْمِ

وَالْمَشْرَبُ الْبَارِدُ فِي ظِلِّ الدَّوْمِ

(Sh), by AIA'shà, *Different are this and embracing and sleeping and the cool drinking-place in the shade of the*

fan-palm! (AAz): (3) i. q. the aor., like ^{أَوَّ} اَوَّ i. q. ^{أَتَوَّجَعُ} اتَّوَجَّعُ

(IA, Sh), ^{أَعَجَبْتُ} اَعَجَبْتُ i. q. ^{أَفَّ} افَّ i. q. ^{أَتَضَجَّرُ} اتَّضَجَّرُ ;

but some drop this division (Sh). The verbal *ns.* are

[all (IA)] *uninfl.* (R, IA, Sh) upon quiescence, like ^{أَصَمَّ} صَمَّ

and ^{أَمَّ} مَّ ; Fath, like ^{أَمِينُ} آمِينُ ; Kasr, like ^{أَيْهَ} إَيْهَ ; or Damm,

like ^{أَهَيْتُ} هَيْتُ (Sh): (1) because of their resemblance [in

sense] to the *orig. uninfl.*, vid. the *pret.* and *imp. v.*

[159] ; and [accordingly] we do not say that ^{أَصَمَّ} صَمَّ is i. q.

^{لَا تَتَكَلَّمْ} لَا تَتَكَلَّمْ *Speak not* and ^{أَلَا تَفْعَلْ} لَا تَفْعَلْ i. q. ^{أَلَا تَفْعَلْ} لَا تَفْعَلْ *Do not*, since, if

so, they would be *infl.*, but that they are i. q. ^{أَسَكَتُ} اسَكَتُ

Be silent and ^{أَكْفَفْتُ} اكْفَفْتُ *Forbear* ; nor that ^{أَفَّ} افَّ is i. q. ^{أَتَضَجَّرُ} اتَّضَجَّرُ

I am disgusted and ^{أَوَّ} اَوَّ i. q. ^{أَتَوَّجَعُ} اتَّوَّجَعُ *I am pained*, since,

if so, they would be *infl.*, but that they are i. q. the

originative ^{أَتَضَجَّرُ} اتَّضَجَّرُ and ^{أَتَوَّجَعْتُ} اتَّوَّجَعْتُ : (2) as may be said,

because they are *ns.* denoting what is *orig. uninfl.*, vid.

the unrestricted *v.* [159], whether it remain in that *o. f.*,

like the *pret.* and *imp.*, or become excluded from it,

like the *aor.* [402, 404] ; and, according to this, the

excuse mentioned [for the rendering of ^{أَصَمَّ} صَمَّ, etc.] is

not needed (R): (3) as before said [159], because of their resemblance to the *p.* in acting as a substitute for the *v.* and not being impressible [by the *op.*] (IA). According to the correct opinion (Fk), the meaning of the term "verbal *ns.*" is that (IY) they are applied to indicate verbal expressions (IY, Fk), as *ns.* indicate their denominates; so that هَيَّات is a *n.* indicating the expression بَعْدُ, and similarly the rest. The object of using them is abbreviation and abridgment and a sort of intensiveness; and, were it not for that, the *vs.* denoted by these *ns.* would be more fit for their position. The manner of the abridgment in them is that they occur uniform for all genders and numbers, as زَيْدٌ or هُنْدٌ or زَيْدَانِ or هُنْدَانِ or زَيْدُونَ or هُنْدَاتٌ; and, as for the intensiveness, صَهْ Hush! is more intensive in meaning than اُسْكُتْ Be silent, and similarly the rest. As for their indicating what *vs.* indicate, vid. *command*, *prohibition*, and the particular *time*, this meaning is imported only from what is indicated by them, not from themselves (IY): so that صَهْ [is a *n.* which (YS)] indicates [the expression (YS)] اُسْكُتْ (IY, YS), while the *command* is understood from the denominate, vid. اُسْكُتْ; and هَيَّات is a *n.*, the denominate of which is another expression, vid. بَعْدُ, so that the *time* is known from the denominate, not from the *n.* (IY). But R says [below] that this is of no account: and the

verbal *n.* is variously said (1) to indicate the *inf. n.*, in which case a distinction between the verbal *n.* and *inf. n.* is needed, since the verbal *n.* is *uninfl.*, and the *inf. n.* *infl.*; (2) to indicate the *accident* and *time* that the *v.* indicates [402], except that the *v.* indicates *time* by the form, and the verbal *n.* by application; (3) to be really a *v.* (YS). What induces the GG to say that these words and their likes are not *vs.*, notwithstanding that they convey the sense of *vs.*, is a *lit.* matter, vid. that their forms are different from those of *vs.*, that they are not conjugable like *vs.*, that the *ل* [2] is prefixed to some of them [200] and the Tanwīn affixed to others [198], and that some of them are 'obviously *advs.* and others *preps.* and *gens.* [199]. As for their *o. fs.*, and what they are transferred from, (1) some of them are obviously transferred from *inf. ns.* and *advs.* [or *preps.* and *gens.*], as ^{فَدَا} لَكَ الْاَقْوَامَ [198], ^{رَوَيْد} زَيْدًا [188], ^{بَلَّ} زَيْدًا [192], ^{اَمَامَكَ} زَيْدًا Take Zaid [but see § 199], orig. ^{زَيْد} اَمَامَكَ [199], since these words are often used according to their original construction, as ^{رَوَيْد} زَيْد and ^{بَلَّ} زَيْد with prothesis, ^{فَدَا} لَكَ with the *nom.* [as a *prepos. enunc.* (IY)] or *acc.* [as an *inf. n.* (IY)], and ^{اَمَامَكَ} زَيْد with the *nom.*: (2) some of them seem to have been orig. *inf. ns.*,

though they are not actually used as *inf. ns.*, as ^{وَشَكَانَ}, ^{قُرْقَاةَ} ^{هَيْهَاتَ}, like ^{لَيَّانَ}, ^{سَرَعَانَ}, ^{بَطْلَانَ}, and ^{شَتَانَ}, like ^{لَيَّانَ}, ^{هَيْهَاتَ} like ^{قُرْقَاةَ}, ^{فَجَارَ} like ^{نَزَالَ}, and ^{ضَرَبَ} like ^{تَيَّدَ} (3) some of them are apparently *ejs.* transferred to [the *cat.* of] *inf. ns.*, and thence to [that of] verbal *ns.*, the *ejs.* transferred to the *cat.* of *inf. ns.* being of two kinds, (a) permanent *inf. ns.*, which do not become verbal *ns.*, as ^{دَعَدَا}, ^{لَعَا}, ^{وَاهَا}, ^{وَيْهَا}, ^{أَيْهَا}, ^{وَيْسَكَ}, ^{وَيْحَكَ}, ^{وَيْلَكَ}, ^{وَيْ لِعَمْرٍو}; (b) transferred from the *cat.* of *inf. ns.* to that of verbal *ns.*, as ^{صَدَا}, ^{هَيْكَ}, ^{هَيْكَ}, ^{أَيَّكَ}, ^{حَيَّ}, ^{هَلَّا}, ^{هَيَّا}, ^{دَعَا}, ^{هَآ}, ^{مَآ}, ^{بُخَّ}, ^{أَوْ}, ^{أَفَّ}, ^{كَيْفَ}, ^{أَخَّ} : whereas ^{هَيْتَ} : whereas ^{أَفَّ} [198], or explained by the *p.*, as ^{أَفَّ} [200], are more properly said to remain *ejs.*, and not to become *inf. ns.* or verbal *ns.*, from the absence of indication of it; just as ^{فَرُّطَكَ} *Advance*, or *Be on thy guard from thy front*, ^{بَعْدَكَ} *Be on thy guard from thy back*, ^{حَذَرَكَ} *Beware of 'Amr*, and ^{الزَّجَاكَ} *Make haste!* [560], are more properly said to retain the quality of *inf. n.*, since there is no indication of their transfer to the *cat.* of verbal *ns.* Thus the verbal *ns.* are proved to be all transferred from original *inf. ns.*, from *inf. ns.* orig. *ejs.*, from *advs.*, or from *preps.* and *gens.* As for

أَمِينُ, it is said to be Sʿriac, of foreign measure, like قَائِلُ *Cain* and هَائِلُ *Abel*, meaning كَذَا, and then made a verbal *n. i. q.* لِيَكُنْ كَذَا *So be it!*, and *uninfl.* upon *Fath*; and to be sometimes lightened by elision of the ا, as أَمِينُ upon the measure of كَرِيم: but there is nothing to prevent its being said to be *orig.* abbreviated and afterwards prolonged; and in that case it is Arabic, *orig.* an *inf. n.*, like نَذِير and نَكِير, and afterwards made a verbal *n. (R)*. You say أَمِينُ, as says the poet

تَبَاعَدْ عَنِّي فَطَاحِلُ رَأْسِ عَمَّةٍ * أَمِينُ فَرَادَ اللَّهُ مَا بَيْنَنَا بَعْدًا

[*Fathal and the son of his paternal uncle have held aloof from me. So be it! Then God increase what is between us in distance! (N)*]; and, if you please, أَمِينُ, as says the poet [AlMajnūn (N)]

يَا رَبِّ لَا تُسَلِّبْنِي حُبَّهَا أَبَدًا * وَيَرْحَمُ اللَّهُ عَبْدًا قَالَ آمِينَا

[*O my Lord, do not Thou ever deprive me of her love: and God have mercy upon a servant that has said "Amen!" (N)*]: but do not double the م for it is wrong (Th). By analogy the verbal *n.* that is *orig.* a *prep.* and *gen.*, as أَلَيْكَ and عَلَيْكَ, should not be called a verbal *n.*, because we call an expression like رَوَيْدُ and صَدُ a *n.* from regard to its *o. f.*, whereas the *prep.* and *gen.* are

not a *n.*; but they apply this name universally to every expression occasionally transferred to the meaning of the *v.*, so that كَذَبَ in such as كَذَبَ الْعَتِيقُ [below] may be called a verbal *n.* (R). The correct opinion is that the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection [159, 199] (Fk). Some assert that the verbal *ns.* are *nom.* in place, as *inchs.* having no *enunc.*, as in أَقَامَ الزَّيْدَانِ [24]: but this is of no account, because قَامَ, though it resembles the *v.*, has the meaning of the *n.*, i. c. دُرُ قِيَامٍ, so that it may be an *inch.*, contrary to the verbal *n.*, in which the quality of *n.* has no meaning; and no regard is paid to the letter, since تَسْمَعُ in تَسْمَعُ الْخُ, though literally a *v.*, is an *inch.*, because it has the meaning of the *n.* [2]. The verbal *n.* then is like the ك of ذَاكَ [172], and like the distinctive [166] according to those who say that it is a *p.*: each of these two had a place in inflection, because of their being *ns.*; but, since they have been transferred to the meaning of the *p.*, they do not retain that [place], because the *p.* has no inflection: and similarly the verbal *n.* had *orig.* a place in inflection; but, since it has been transferred to the meaning of the *v.*, and the *v.* has *orig.* no place in inflection, it also does not retain a place in inflection. Nor is what some mention, vid. that the verbal *ns.* are *acc.* in position as *inf. ns.*, of any account, since, if they were so, the *vs.* would be supplied before them [41], so that they

would not act as substitutes for the *v.*, and therefore would not be *uninfl.*: nor do we say that ^{أَمَّا} i. q. ^{تَقْدِمُ} [199] is governed in the *acc.* by a supplied *v.* [498], but the sign of the *acc.* in it becomes like the Fath of the ^ف in ^{جَعْفَرُ}; nor that ^{عَلَيْكَ} and ^{إِلَيْكَ}, when verbal *ns.*, are *preps.* dependent upon a supplied [*v.*]; but the *pre.* and *post.* in the 1st, and the *prep.* and *gen.* in the 2nd, become like one word. Thus the *inf. n.* and *ej.* when verbal *ns.*, become like ^{الْقَضْلُ} and ^{بَيْتُهُ} [4] when proper names of a person; and the *pre.* and *post.* and the *prep.* and *gen.*, when verbal *ns.*, become like ^{عَبْدُ اللَّهِ} and ^{تَابِعًا شَرًّا} when proper names: so that they are transferred from their original meanings to the meaning of the *v.* in the same way as proper names are transferred. And what some say [above], vid. that ^{صَدَ} e. g. is a *n.* denoting the *expression* ^{أَسْكَنْتَ}, which is indicative of the meaning of the *v.*, so that ^{صَدَ} is a proper name for the *expression* of the *v.*, not for its *meaning*, is of no account, since the pure Arab sometimes says ^{صَدَ} notwithstanding that the *expression* ^{أَسْكَنْتَ} does not occur to his mind, and perhaps has never been heard by him at all; while, if you said that it was a *n.* denoting ^{أَصْمَتَ} or ^{أَمْتَنَعَ مِنَ الْكَلَامِ} or anything else that conveyed this meaning, it would be correct: so that we know that what is intended is the *meaning*, not the

expression. And sometimes the *v.* becomes a verbal *n.*, as in the saying of 'Antara

كَذَبَ الْعَتِيقُ وَمَاءَ شَيْءٍ بَارِدًا
أَنْ كُنْتُ سَأَلْتَنِي غُبُوقًا فَاذْهَبِي

Take wine and cold water of a waterskin : if thou be asking me for an evening-draught of milk, get thee gone, when related with الْعَتِيقُ in the *acc.*; and similarly in the saying of him who on looking at an emaciated he-camel said to its owner كَذَبَ عَلَيْكَ الْبِزْرُ وَالنَّوَى *Keep to, and Take, seeds and date-stones with الْبِزْرُ in the acc.:* IS says that Mudar make it govern the *acc.*, and AlYaman the *nom.*; for كَذَبَ عَلَيْكَ الْبِزْرُ means الزِّمَّةُ and خَذَا, because, *lying* being held by them to be extremely disgraceful, and an act whose author the person lied against is instigated to *keep to* and *seize*, كَذَبَ فَلَانٌ *Such a one has lied* comes to mean an *instigation to keep to him*, i. e. *Keep to, and Seize him, for he is a liar*; and, when conjoined with عَلَيْكَ, it becomes more intensive in instigation, as though you said *He has forged against thee; therefore seize him*; and afterwards it is used in instigating to *keep to* every thing, even if it be not such as *lying* proceeds from, as in the saying [of 'Umar to 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib, when the latter complained to him of pain in the sinews from walking (D),]

عَلَيْكَ بِالْعَسَلِ keep to trotting, i. e. عَلَيْكَ بِالْعَسَلِ ,
and in the saying of the poet

وَذُبْيَانِيَّةٌ أَرْضَتْ بَنِيهَا • بَانَ كَذَبَ الْقَرَّاطِقِ وَالْقُرُوفِ

[And (many) a Dhubyānī (woman was there) that
enjoined her sons to keep to, i. e. take care of, the coats
and leathern cases (N)], i. e. عَلَيْكُمْ بِهَا , and in كَذَبَ الدَّحْمِ
Keep to the pilgrimage, i. e. عَلَيْكَ بِهِ ; so that, as عَلَيْكَ
and إِلَيْكَ , becoming i. q. the imp. v. [199], may govern
the acc., so كَذَبَ and عَلَيْكَ , becoming i. q. the
imp., may govern the acc., as الزَّمْ does (R). The
verbal ns. have the same government as the vs. that
they act as substitutes for : so that, if that v. govern
the nom. only, the verbal n. does so too, as صَدَّ i. q.
بَعْدَ زَيْدٍ i. q. هَيْهَاتَ زَيْدٍ , أَكْفَفَ i. q. مَهْ , أَسْكَنَ
a latent [165] pron. being in صَدَّ and مَهْ , as in أَسْكَنَ
and أَكْفَفَ , and زَيْدٌ being governed in the nom. by
هَيْهَاتَ [20], as by بَعْدَ ; and, if that v. govern the nom.
and acc., the verbal n. does so too, as فَرَاكَ زَيْدًا i. q.
أَضْرَبَ i. q. ضَرَابَ عَمْرًا and أَدْرَكَ
and زَيْدًا and عَمْرًا being governed in
the acc. by them [44] (IA). The ب is often red. in

their *obj.*, as **عَلَيْكَ بِهِ**, because, being weak in government, they are supported by a *p.* accustomed to conduct the *intrans.* to the *obj.* [433, 503]. According to the BB, they are not preceded by their *accs.*, from regard to the *o. f.*, because they are mostly *inf. ns.*, which may not be preceded by their *regs.* [342]; or *ejs.* aplastic in themselves, transferred to the *cat.* of *inf. ns.* and thence to that of the verbal *n.*; or *adv.* or *preps.* and *gens.*, which also are weak before the transfer, since their government is [merely] because of their implying the sense of the *v.*: but the KK allow that, citing as evidence **يَا أَيُّهَا الْمَائِدَةُ آخِ** [*my bucket take thou* (Jsh)] ; whereas, according to the BB, **دُونِكَ** here is not a verbal *n.*, but an *adv.*, *enunc.* of **دَلَوِي** [1], i. e. *my bucket is before thee*: (*then take it*) (R). The verbal *n.*, like the *v.*, is not *pre.*: and therefore they say that **بَلِّغْ** and **رَوِّدْ** in **بَلِّغْ زَيْدَ** [192] and **رَوِّدْ زَيْدَ** [188] are *inf. ns.*, the Fatha being a Fatha of inflection; and in **بَلِّغْ زَيْدًا** and **رَوِّدْ زَيْدًا** verbal *ns.*, the Fatha being then known to be a Fatha of uninflectedness, because of the absence of Tanwīn. The *aor.* is not governed in the *subj.* in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.*: you do not say **صَلِّ فَاحْدِثْكَ** with the *subj.*, contrary to the opinion of Ks [411]; but the *aor.* is governed in the *apoc.* in its *correl.*, as **مَكَانِكَ** آخِ [420, 421] (Sh). Most of the verbal *ns.* are i. q.

the *imp.*, since in command one often contents oneself with making a sign instead of articulating its expression, and much more therefore may one content oneself with an expression acting as a substitute for it; whereas enunciation is not like that: and the meanings of the verbal *ns.*, whether *imp.* or otherwise, are more intensive and *corrob.* than those of the *vs.* that they are said to be in the sense of; while all that are enunciatory contain the sense of *wonder*, so that هَيْهَاتَ means *How far!*, شَتَّىْ *How different!*, سُرْعَانِ and وَشْكَانِ *How quick!*, and بَطْلَانِ *How slow!*, the *wonder* being the *corroboration* mentioned. All of them are without any sign for the [attached] *pron.* governed by them in the *nom.* [161, 163, 165], the prominence of which in any of them proves it to be a *v.*, and not one of them, like هَلَمْ [189] and هَاتِ [below]. The affixion of the ك of allocution [163, 560] and of the Tanwīn [198, 608] is not regular in all these *ns.*, but is restricted to hearsay. When the ك is attached to these *ns.*, then, (1) if it be attached to what is *orig.* an *adv.* or *prep.*, it is a *n.* governed in the *gen.* from regard to its *o. f.*, as in أَيْيَكُ and أَمَامَكَ [199]; (2) if it be attached to what occurs both as a *pre. inf. n.* and as a verbal *n.*, as رَوَيْدٌ زَيْدٌ and زَيْدًا [188], it may be either a *n.* governed in the *gen.* from regard to the *n.*'s being an *inf. n. pre.* to its *ag.*, or a *p.* of allocution from regard to the *n.*'s being a verbal *n.*,

as in ^{هَـ}رَوَيْدَكَ زَيْدًا [161, 188, 560]; (3) if it may not be *post.*, it is a *p.* of allocution, as in هَاكَ [190], since ^{هَـ}زَيْدٌ does not occur (R). As R says (Sn), according to the majority (R), the Tanwīn affixed to some of these *ns.* denotes *indeterminateness* [608], not of the *v.* signified by that *n.* pronounced with Tanwīn, since the *v.* is neither *det.* nor *indet.*, but of the *inf. n.* signified by that *n.* before it became a verbal *n.*, [because the verbal *n.* pronounced with Tanwīn is either an *inf. n.* or an *ej.* firstly substituted for the *inf. n.* and secondly transferred to the *cat.* of the verbal *n.*, so that سَكُوتًا مَّا means : and therefore the verbal *n.* divested of Tanwīn, out of those that Tanwīn is affixed to, is like the *det.* (R),] so that سَكَّ السُّكُوتَ الْمَعْرُوفَ الْمَعْيَنَ Be silent with the known, specified silence, [and, specification of the *inf. n.* being by specification of its *reg.*, i. e. the story that silence is kept from, this means أَفْعَلَ السُّكُوتَ عَنْ هَذَا الْحَدِيثِ الْمَعْيَنِ Keep silence from this specified story (R)]; and accordingly it is allowable for the person addressed not to keep silence from something else than the story indicated; [and similarly مِمَّا means Abstain from this thing, and أَيْدِ means Tell the known story, the determination in the *inf. n.* being reducible to determination of its *reg.* (R):] and [the indeterminateness is

similar, so that (R)] ^{صَ} means ^{أَسْكُتْ سَكُوتًا}, i. e. *Keep unrestricted silence*, [*applicable to every silence supposable* (R),] *from whatever story it be* (R, Sn), since there is no specification in it (Sn): and, according to them, omission of the TanwIn is not evidence of determination in all the verbal *ns.* [198], but only in such as the TanwIn of indeterminateness is affixed to (R). From this it follows that the verbal *ns.* in the state of determination belong to the class of *n.* made *det.* by the ^{أَلْ} denoting *knowledge* [599], which is plainer than the saying of some that they then belong to the class of *n.* made *det.* by the ^{أَلْ} denoting *genus*, and than the saying of others that they then belong to the class of generic proper name [198] (Sn). But, according to ISk and Jh, its affixion to such of them as it is affixed to is evidence of their being continuous with what follows them, and its suppression is evidence of pause upon them: you say ^{صَ صَ} and ^{مَ مَ} with TanwIn in the 1st and quiescence of the δ in the 2nd; and the saying of Dhu-r Rumma

وَقَفْنَا فَقُلْنَا إِيَّاهُ عَنْ أُمِّ سَالِمٍ * وَمَا بَالُ تَكْلِيمِ الدِّيَارِ الْبَلَادِعِ

[198] *We stopped, and said, Tell us more about Umm Salim! And what is the good of speaking to the empty dwellings?* occurs, say they, without TanwIn, though he does continue, because pause is meant to be understood: so that, according to them, the TanwIn is *orig*

the Tanwīn of declinability indicating that what it is affixed to is continuous with what follows it, not paused upon [609, 640], being divested of the meaning of declinability in these *ns.*, and put to indicate the meaning mentioned (R). The verbal *ns.* are of two kinds, (1) *imp.*, which has the prevalence, (a) *trans.*, as (a) رويد ^{رَوِيْدٌ}, ^{رَوِيْدٌ} زيدا Deal gently with Zaid, and Give him time [188], i. e. ارود ^{اَرُوْدُ} and امهل ^{اَمْهَلْ}, [orig. the *inf. n.* اراد ^{اَرَادَ}, and made a curt *dim.* by elision of the *augs.* (291) ; or, as Fr says, *dim.* of رود ^{رُوْدٌ} gentleness (IY)] : (b) تيد ^{تَيْدٌ} زيدا i. q. رويد ^{رَوِيْدٌ}, [and تيدك ^{تَيْدُكَ} transmitted by the Bdd, most probably derived from تود ^{تُوْدٌ} slowness, the ف being a و permanently changed into ت, as in توراة ^{تَوْرَاةٌ} (689), and the ع being a Hamza irregularly changed into ي for a kind of alleviation, as in قرأت ^{قُرْأَتٌ} for قرئت ^{قُرِيتٌ} (685) (IY)] : (c) هلم ^{هَلُمَّ} زيدا Bring Zaid near, and Present him, i. e. قرب ^{قَرِبْ} and احضر ^{اَحْضُرْ} [189] : (d) هب ^{هَبْ} الشئ ^{الشَّيْءَ} Give me the thing [428], i. e. اعطني ^{اَعْطِنِيْ}, [which has the *pron.* of the *du.* and *pl.* affixed to it, because of its strong resemblance to the *v.* (IY),] whence II. 105. [and in tradition هاتوا ^{هَاتُوا} ربع ^{رَبْعَ} عشور ^{عَشُورَ} Give ye the fourth of the tenths of your goods, like هلم ^{هَلُمَّ} (189) and هاء ^{هَاءٌ} (190) (IY)] : (e) هاء ^{هَاءٌ} زيدا Take Zaid, i. e. خذ ^{خُذْ} [190] : (f) حيهل ^{حَيْهَلْ} التريد ^{التَّرِيْدَ}, i. e. ايت ^{اَيْتْ} [191] :

(IY): (f) هَيْكُ Make haste in what thou art about, [the *n.* being هَيَّ, and the ك a *p.* of allocution (IY),] and هَيْكُ [lightened by elision of one ي (IY)], and هَيَّا, [the ا being put for pause when the ك is not affixed (IY),] i. e. اَسْرِعْ فِيمَا اَنْتَ فِيْهِ, as

لَتَقْرَبْنَ قَرَبًا جُلْدِيًّا * مَا دَامَ فِيْهِنَّ فَصِيلٌ حَيًّا
فَقَدْ دَجَا اللَّيْلُ فَهَيَّا هَيَّا

[by Ibn Mayyāda (IY, AAz), addressing his she-camel (IY), *Assuredly thou shalt make a rapid journey by night to the watering-place of the morning, so long as a young weaned camel continues to be among them. (If thou resolve upon journeying, the ف being the correl. of the prop.,) the night has grown dark: then make haste, make haste (AAz):* (g) نَزَالٍ Alight, i. e. اِنْزَلْ [193]: (h) قَدْ اِكْتَفَ and قَطَكَ and قَدْ اِنْتَفَ, [the ك being a *p.* of allocution, and قَدْ and قَطَا contracted from قَدْ and قَطَا, because they are derived from قَطَطْتُ and قَدَدْتُ الشَّيْءَ I cut the thing along and across, as though being satisfied were a cutting off from everything else (IY): (i) اَلَيْكَ Be off, i. e. تَنَحَّ, [as in the verse {of 'Abīd Ibn AlĀbras (SR)} cited by Th.

اَنْهَبُ الْيَكْ فَاَنْيَ مِنْ بَنِي اَسَدٍ
اَهْلُ الْقَبَابِ وَاَهْلُ الْخَيْلِ وَالنَّادِي

Go, be off, for verily I am of the *Bunè Asad*, the people of the tents made of skins, and the people of the horses and the assembly, as though the poet said اَنْهَبُ تَنْم (IY)]; and اَلِي I will be off, heard by Akh from a man when الْيَكْ was said to him, as though تَنْم had been said to him, and he said اَتَنْهَى [199]: (j) *Recover thyself*, i. e. اَنْتَعْشِ, [said to the stumbler or to him that is afflicted by a calamity, as

اَلْحَى اَللهُ قَرَمًا لَمْ يَقُولُوا لِعَاثِرٍ
وَلَا لِابْنِ عَمٍّ نَالَ الدَّهْرُ دَعْدَا

God shame a people that say not to a stumbler, nor to a son of a paternal uncle that fortune has afflicted, "*Recover thyself!*" (IY)]; and دَعْدَا or دَعَا لَكَ, [which is, however, an *infl. inf. n.*, like سَقِيَا لَكَ (IY), because it is explained by the p.]: (k) اَمِيْنُ and اَمِيْنُ Answer Thou, [said in prayer (IY),] i. q. اَسْتَجِبْ (2) enun-
ciatory, [which is rare (IY),] as (a) هَيْهَاتَ ذَاكَ Very, or Wholly, far is that! [195], i. e. [جَدَا (IY)] بَعْدَ [or كَلَّ الْبَعْدُ, which requires an *ag.*, like the *v.*, as هَيْهَاتَ

هَيْهَاتَ الْعَقِيقِ الضِّ (above): while in XXIII. 38. (504) some say that the ل is *red.*, and مَا the *ag.*, i. e. هَيْهَاتَ *Far, far off, is what etc.*; some that the *ag.* is suppressed, i. e. بَعْدَ الصَّدَقِ أَمَّا الْخُ *Far, far off is (the fulfilment) of what etc.*; and some that the *ag.* is a *pron.* in هَيْهَاتَ, i. e. هَيْهَاتَ بَعَثَكُمْ *Far, far off is your resurrection or your bring brought forth, because the اخراج is previously mentioned (IY)]*: (b) شَتَانِ زَيْدٍ وَعَمْرُو [196], i. e. أَفْتَرَقَا and تَدَايَا, [the ن of which is sometimes pronounced with Kasr (IY)]: (c) سَرَعَانِ ذَا أَفَالَةَ, i. e. سَرَعٌ, [a *proc.*, meaning *How quick is this as melted fat!*, أَفَالَةَ being in the *acc.* as a *sp.* (IY)]: (d) وَشَتَانِ ذَا قَرَبٍ [and وَشَكٌ (IY)], i. e. قَرَبٌ [and وَشَكٌ, *How quick, and soon, is this in coming forth,* خُرُوجًا being in the *acc.* as a *sp.* (IY)]: (e) أَفٌ I am disgusted, i. q. أَتَضَجُّرُ [197]: (f) أَوْءٌ I am pained, i. q. أَتَرْجِعُ (M), which has several *dial. vars.*, أَوْءٌ مِنْ كَذَا, as

فَاؤَةٌ لِيَذْكُرَهَا إِذَا مَا ذَكَرْتُهَا * وَمِنْ بَعْدِ أَرْضِي بَيْنَنَا وَسَمَاءِ

[Then alas for the remembrance of her, whenever I remember her, and for the distance of earth between us and sky! (N)], أَوْءٌ, أَوْءٌ, and أَوْءٌ (IY). The chastest

is ^{كسرة}اوة with Kasr, Damm, or Fath of the δ , Kasr being the most prevalent, as ^{كسرة}فاوة ^{فتحة}اِيْ كَرَاهَا ^{كسرة}الْع (D). ^{كسرة}قَدْ is (1) a *n. syn.* with ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ, (a) mostly *uninfl.*, because of its resemblance to the *p.* ^{كسرة}قَدْ [575] in its letter, and to many *ps.* in its [*bil.* (DM)] constitution, as ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ *Zaid's sufficiency is a dirham* and ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}نِيْ *My sufficiency*; (b) seldom *infl.*, as ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ with [^{كسرة}قَدْ in (DM)] the *nom.*, like ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ, and ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}نِيْ, like ^{كسرة}حَسْبِيْ : (2) a verbal *n.*, [always *uninfl.* (DM),] *syn.* with ^{كسرة}يَكْفِيْ, as ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ *A dirham suffices Zaid* and ^{كسرة}قَدْ ^{كسرة}نِيْ *suffices me*, like ^{كسرة}يَكْفِيْ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ and ^{كسرة}يَكْفِيْنِيْ [170]. ^{كسرة}قَطَا is (1) [a *n.* (DM)] *syn.* with ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ, as ^{كسرة}قَطَا ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ *My sufficiency is a dirham* and ^{كسرة}قَطَا ^{كسرة}كَ *Thy sufficiency* and ^{كسرة}قَطَا ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ *Zaid's sufficiency*, like ^{كسرة}حَسْبِيْ ^{كسرة}دِرْهَمٍ and ^{كسرة}حَسْبِكَ and ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ ^{كسرة}زَيْدٍ, except that it is *uninfl.*, because it is constituted of two letters, whereas ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ is *infl.*: (2) a verbal *n. syn.* with ^{كسرة}يَكْفِيْ, as ^{كسرة}قَطَا ^{كسرة}نِيْ *Suffices me*, like ^{كسرة}يَكْفِيْنِيْ; and the ^{كسرة}و of protection is allowable in the 1st case also, [where it is *syn.* with ^{كسرة}حَسْبُ (DM),] for preservation of the uninflectedness upon quiescence. ^{كسرة}بَجَلْ is (1) a

verbal *n. syn.* with يَكْفِي, as بَجَلْنِي Suffices me, [like يَكْفِينِي (DM)], which [usage (DM)] is rare: (2) a *n. syn.* with حَسْب, as بَجَلِي My sufficiency, whence

أَلَا أَنَّنِي شَرِبْتُ أَسْوَدَ حَالِكًا
أَلَا بَجَلِي مِنْ ذَا الشَّرَابِ أَلَا بَجَل

[by Tarafa, Now, verily I have drunk a dark, black (poison): now, I have had enough of this draught, now, enough! (Jsh); and in this case expression of the ن is rare (170) (DM)]. أَلَا is a [verbal (DM)] *n. i. q.* as اعْجَب, as

وَأَبَايَ أَنْتِ وَفَوْقِ الْأَشْذَبِ * كَأَنَّمَا ذُرٌّ عَلَيْهِ الزَّرْنَبُ
أَوْ زَنْجَبِيلٌ وَهُوَ عِنْدِي أَطْيَبُ

[by a Rājiz of Taim (FA), I marvel at thy beauty (with my father be thou ransomed!); and thy cool sweet mouth is as though saffron had been sprinkled upon it, or ginger, which to my mind is nicer (FA), (DM)]: and sometimes وَهَّا [198] is said, as

وَاهَّا لَسَلِمَى ثُمَّ وَاهَّا وَاهَّا * هِيَ الْأَمْنَى لَوْ أَنَّا نَلْنَاهَا

[by Abu-nNajm al'Ijlī, I marvel at the niceness of Salma, again I marvel, I marvel! She is (the object of) desires—would that we had got them! (Jsh)]; and وَهَّا [200], as

وَيَ كَانَ مِنْ يَكُنْ لَهْ نَشَبَ يَحْ—بَب وَمِنْ يَفْتَقِرْ يَعِشْ عَيْشَ ضَرٍ

[by Sa'īd Ibn Zaid asṢaḥābī, *I wonder! Verily he that has wealth is beloved, and he that is needy lives a life of hardship* (Jsh)]. And sometimes the ك of allocution is affixed to this [وَيَ i. q. اَعْجَب (DM)], as

وَلَقَدْ شَفَى نَفْسِي وَابْرَأَ سَقْمَهَا * قِيلَ الْوَارِثُ وَيَكُ عَنْتَرُ اقْدِمْ

[by 'Antara, *And assuredly the saying of the horsemen "I wonder {at thee (Jsh)}, 'Antara, advance!" did heal my mind, and cure its distemper* (FA, Jsh)]; but Ks says that وَيَكُ is orig. وَيَلِكُ, in which case the ك is a pron.

governed in the gen. [by prothesis (FA)]: and, as for وَيَكُ اَنْ اللّٰه XXVIII. 82. [200], Akh says that وَيَ is

is a verbal n., the ك a p. of allocution [affixed to وَيَ, as in وَيَكُ عَنْتَرُ اَلْحَ (K)], and اَنْ [in the position of a gen.] by subaudition of the ل, the sense being *I marvel*

because God; but Khl says that وَيَ is separate [from وَيَ (K)], as in وَيَ كَانَ مِنْ اَلْحَ [above], in which case وَيَ denotes *verification* [531], as in

كَانَنِي حِينَ امْسَى لَا تَكَلَّمْنِي * مَتِيمَ يَشْتَهِي مَا كَبَسَ مَوْجِدَارَ

[by Sulaimān Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, or, as is said (Jsh), by 'Umar Ibn Abī Rabī'a (KA, Jsh) alMakhzūmī, *Verily I, when I enter upon the evening while she speaks not to me.*

am a thrall that longs for what is not to be found (Jsh)],
i. e. ^{اننى}, [the sense being *I marvel! Verily God*]
(MB).

§ 188. ^{روى} is (1) [*uninfl.* (M),] a verbal *n.* (M, R), transferred from the *inf. n.* [187], through frequency of usage, by the *v.*'s not being supplied before it, but the *inf. n.*'s being made to act as a substitute for the *v.*, and pronounced with Fath only because it is *uninfl.* upon the vowel appropriate in inflection [199] (R), *trans.* to a [single (IY) direct (R)] *obj.*, as ^{روى زيدا} (IY, R): the poet [Mālik Ibn Khālīd alKhunā'ī (DH)] says

^{روى عليا جد ما ثدى امهم * الىنا ولكى بغضهم متمائى}

[*Let 'Alī alone for a while: their relationship to us has been cut off, but their hatred is old, remote* (DH)],

'Alī being a tribe [of Kināna (ISk), ^{ما} *red.* (DH)], and

^{ثدى} a *met.* for ^{قرابة} (IY); and [sometimes ^{ما} is redun-

dantly added to ^{روى} when a verbal *n.*, as (R)] an Arab

said [to his fellow (R)] ^{والله لو اردت الدراهم لاعطيتك}

^{روى ما الشعر} (M, R), i. e. *By God, if thou hadst desired*

dirhams, I would have given to thee: [then (IY)] let,

poetry alone, [thou hast no need of it (IY)], and [some-

times the ك of allocution is affixed to it, so that (IY)]

^{روى زيدا} [161, 187, 560] is said (IY, R), where it may be

either a verbal *n.*, the ك being a *p.*, or an *inf. n. pre.* to the *ag.* (R): (2) *infl.* (M), (a) an *inf. n.* (IY, R) i. q. the *act.*

part. (R), used as (a) an *ep.* [of an *inf. n.* (R)], as سَارُوا

رَوَيْدَا They journeyed with gentle journeying, [i. e.

مَرَوَيْدَا (R)]; (b) a *d. s.*, as سَارُوا رَوَيْدَا They journeyed

gently (M, R), i. e. مَرَوَيْدَا (IY, R): it is an *ep.* of the *inf.*

n. when you mention the latter, and a *d. s.* when you do not, because of the weakness of suppressing the qualified and putting the *ep.* into its place [149]; but what is meant

may be سَارُوا سَيِّرَا رَوَيْدَا, the qualified being suppressed, and the *ep.* put into its place, though this construction is

weak (IY): (b) an *inf. n.* (M, R) i. q. ارْوَادَا (M), which is the origin of the two other kinds, [vid. 1 and 2 (a), and is sometimes] (a) *trans.* to the direct *obj.* (R), as

ارْوَدَ زَيْدَا رَوَيْدَا (IY, R), i. e. ارْوَدَ زَيْدَا رَوَيْدَا, the *v.* being

suppressed, and the *inf. n.* made to act as a substitute

for it (IY), like ضَرَبَا زَيْدَا [41] (R); (b) *pre.* [to the *obj.*

(IY, R)], as رَوَيْدَا زَيْدَا, like فُضِرَبَ الرِّقَابِ XLVII. 4.

Smite ye the necks (M, R). In فَمَهْلُ الْكَافِرِينَ امْهَلُوا رَوَيْدَا

LXXXVI. 17. Then let the unbelievers alone, let them

alone quietly it may be an *inf. n.* [i. q. امْهَلَا (MA*d*), a

corrob. upon a corrob. (Sh on the corrob.)]; or an *ep.*

of a [suppressed] *inf. n.*, [i. e. امْهَلَا يَسِيرَا (K, B)]; or

a d. e. (R): the poet says رَوِّدَا بَنِي شَيْهَانَ أَلْع [156], which is also related رَوِّدْ (IY), *Leave off, Banù Shaihan, some of your threatening*, رَوِّدْ being the obj. of [the inf. n. رَوِّدَا or verbal n. رَوِّدْ] (FA, Jsh): the Hudhali says رَوِّدْ عَلَيَّ جَدَّ أَلْع [above] (ISk): and the prov. says رَوِّدْكَ الشَّعْرَ يَغْبُ *Leave the poetry alone. It will remain a night*, [like رَوِّدْكَ زَيْدًا] (T).

§ 189. هَلَمْ is compounded, (1) according to our school, from the premonitory p. [هَ (IY)] together with لَمْ, [its o. f., says Khl, being هَ لَمْ, from the saying لَمْ يَجْعَلْهُ اللَّهُ شَعْنَهُ *God unite his disunion*], i. e. جَعَلَ, as though the speaker meant لَمْ نَقْسِكْ أَيْنَا *Unite (thyself to us)*, i. e. اقْرَبْ *Draw near*; and (IY)] the هَ being elided from هَ [for alleviation, because of frequency of usage, and because the ل after it, though mobilé, is in the predicament of the quiescent, since the o. f. and the stronger of the two dial. vars., vid. the Hījāzī, is هَ أَلَمْ (731), so that the هَ of هَ is elided because of the concurrence of two quiescents (IY)]: (2) according to the KK, from هَلْ together with لَمْ, [its o. f., says Fr, being هَلْ لَمْ, i. e. اقْصِدْ and (IY)] the Hamza being [alleviated

by having its vowel thrown upon the **ل**, and being (IY)] elided, [so that the word becomes هَلَمْ ; and the هَلْ compounded with اَمْ being the one denotative not of *interrogation*, but of *chiding* and *urging*, from the saying

وَلَقَدْ يَسْمَعُ قَوْلِي حَتَّى هَلْ

(191) (IY)]. The Hījāsīs make it uniform in all numbers and genders, [like مُمْ, ضُمْ, etc. ; which form is in accordance with analogy (187), and occurs in the Revelation, as وَالْقَائِلِينَ لِأَخْوَانِهِمْ هَلُمَّ إِلَيْنَا XXXIII. 18. *And the sayers to their brethren, Come hither to us* (IY)]: but the Banū Tamīm, [having regard to the v. لَمْ, and giving predominance to its side (IY),] say هَلْمُوا, هَلْمِي, and [according to the BB and most of the KK (IY)] هَلْمْنِي, [because the **ل** of the word becomes quiescent upon attachment of this **ن** to it, as ضَرَبْنِي, and, when the letter before the **ن** becomes quiescent, the incorporation is annulled, and the word becomes like اَرَدْنِي (731) ; while Fr asserts that هَلْمْنِي ought to be said, because, this **ن** being always preceded by a quiescent, they add a 2nd **ن** before it for the quiescence to fall upon, in order that the Fatha of the **م** in هَلَمْ may be preserved, as they say عَنِّي and مِنِّي, adding a

2nd **ن** in order that the **ن** of **مِنْ** and **عَنْ** may be preserved from Kasr (170); and **هَلَمِينَ** also has been transmitted from some of the Arabs, the letter added for protection being made a **ي**, which is anomalous (IY)]. It is *trans.*, [as **هَلَمْ زَيْدًا** (IY)], i. q. **قَرِيبَةً** and **أَحْضَرَةً** (IY),] like **هَاتِ**; and *intrans.*, [as **هَلَمْ يَا زَيْدُ** (IY),] i. q. **تَعَالُ** and **أَقْبُلْ**: e. g. **هَلَمْ شَهِدَاكُمْ** VI. 151. *Bring forward your witnesses* and XXXIII. 18. (M). And sometimes **هَلَمْ لَكَ** is said, **هَلَمْ** being explained by the **ل**, because, though not *orig.* an *inf. n.*, it is treated like the verbal *ns.* that are explained by the *prep.* from regard to their *o. f.* when they were *inf. ns.*, as XXIII. 38. [187, 504], i. e. **بَعْدَا** (R). And As relates that, when **هَلَمْ** [or **هَلَمْ كَذَا** (IY, R)] is said to a man, he says **لَا أَهْلَمْ** (M, R) or **لَا أَهْلَمُهُ**, *orig.* **لَا أَلَمْ** (IY, R), like **لَا أَرَبُ** (IY), the **ا** pronounced with Fathā being *aug.* (R), as though he restored it to its *o. f.* before the composition (IY); or **لَا أَرْمُ** according to the other opinion, the **ا** and **ل** not being altered in the reply from regard to the form of the address (R): but this is anomalous (IY).

§ 190. ^{هـ} is i. q. ^{خُذْ} (M, R), ^{تَنَاولْ}, and the like (IY). It has 8 *dial. vars.*:—(1) you say ^{هـ} with a single quiescent ^{هـ} for the *sing.*, *du.*, and *pl.*, *masc.* or *fem.* (R): (2) you affix [to this single ^{هـ} (R)] the [*p.* (IY, R)] ^ك [of allocution (IY, R)]; and vary it [according to the states of the person addressed (M) in gender and number (IY)], as ^{هَآك}, [^{هَآك}, ^{هَآكُمَا}, ^{هَآكُم}, and ^{هَآكُنَّ} (IY, R)]: (3) you affix [to the ^{هـ} (IY, R)] a Hamza in place of the ^ك; and vary it like the ^ك, as ^{هَآه} (M, R), ^{هَآهْمَا}, ^{هَآهْم}, [^{هَآهْمُنَّ}, [whence LXIX. 19. (22) (IY),] and ^{هَآهْنُ} (IY, R): this is the best *dial. var.* (IY, B on LXIX. 19.), and is the one that occurs in the Scripture; but ^{هَآهْم} is strange, because the ^م is found in the *pron.* of the 2nd *pers.* only when it is not in the *imp.*, as ^{هَآهْمُ} and ^{هَآهْمَا} (IY): (4) you combine the Hamza and the ^ك, [as ^{هَآهْك} (M), to corroborate the allocution (IY),] pronouncing the Hamza with Fath, and varying the ^ك (M, R): (5) you say ^{هـ} with a quiescent Hamza after the ^{هـ} for all [numbers and genders]: (6) you conjugate this 5th like ^{هَآه} (R); [for] some say ^{هـ} upon the measure of ^{هَآه}, and conjugate it like the latter (M), as ^{هَآه}, ^{هَآهِي}, ^{هَآهِي}, ^{هَآهِي}, and ^{هَآهِي} (IY): (7) you conjugate it like ^{خُفْ} (IY, R), as ^{هَآه}, ^{هَآه}

or هَآءِ , هَآءِ , هَآءُ , and هَآءِ , making it a v. [below], which is corroborated by the saying مِمَّنْ أَهَآءُ From whom shall I take? transmitted by Ks as said in reply to هَآءِ , like مِمَّنْ أَخَافُ ; and, according to this opinion, it is on the measure of يَفْعَلُ فَعَلٌ , like أَخَالَ خَلَتْ , for which reason the Hamza of its initial may be pronounced with Kasr [404] (IY): (8) you [affix a Hamza to the ا , and (R)] conjugate it like (M, R) نَادَ (R) [or] دَامَ (M), as هَآءِ , هَآءِ , هَآءِ , هَآءُ , and هَآءِ ; and the saying of 'Alī

أَفَاطِلُ هَآءِ السَّيْفِ غَيْرُ مَذْمُومٍ * فَلَسْتُ بِرَعْدِيٍّ وَلَا بِلَيْتِيٍّ

[O Fāṭima, take the sword not blamed; for I am not dastardly, nor base (DA)] may be of the 3rd dial. or of this, the ي being elided in the latter case because of the quiescence of the ج after it (IY). The last three are aplastic vs. [above], having neither pret. nor aor., not verbal ns. [187] (R).

§ 191. حَيَّهْل is compounded of حَيَّ and [هَلْ or (AAz)] هَلْ , [two ejs. meaning urging and hastening (IY)]. It is uninfl. upon Fath, [as حَيَّهْل , whence إِذَا حَيَّهْلًا (below) (IY)]; and حَيَّهْلًا

with Tanwīn [198] is said, [whence ^{بَحِيهَلًا} ^{يَزْجُرُونَ} ^{أَلْع} (below), according to the usual version (AAz)]; and ^{بَحِيهَلًا} with the ʾ : S mentions these *dial. vars.*; and others add ^{بَحِيهَل}, [whence ^{يَتَمَارَى} ^{أَلْع} (below) (IY),] and ^{بَحِيهَل}, and ^{بَحِيهَلًا} (M). When you pause upon ^{بَحِيهَلًا} and ^{بَحِيهَلًا}, you convert their ^ن into ʾ [615]; but in continuity expression of the ʾ in them is a vicious *dial.*: and Labīd in his saying

^{يَتَمَارَى} ^{فِي} ^{الَّذِي} ^{قُلْتُ} ^{لَهُ} * ^{وَلَقَدْ} ^{يَسْمَعُ} ^{قَوْلِي} ^{بَحِيهَل}

[mentioning a fellow-traveller whom he was bidding to start, *He doubts about what I have said to him; and assuredly he does hear my saying "Come along"* (MAR),] makes the ʾ quiescent for the sake of the rhyme; but this is not allowable except in pause: and the KSh gives ^{بَحِيهَل} [187] with [Fath of the ʾ and (AAz)] Kasr and Tanwīn of the ʾ (R). It is (1) [i. q. ^{أَيْت}, and therefore (R)] *trans.* by itself, [as ^{بَحِيهَل} ^{الْتَرِيد} *Come to the crumbled bread moistened with broth* (R)]: (2) [i. q. ^{أَسْرَعَ}, and therefore (R)] *trans.* by (a) the ب, as [in the speech of ‘Ahd Allāh Ibn Mas‘ud (AAz) in tradition (M)] ^{أَنَا} ^{ذَكَرَ} ^{الْأَصَالِحُونَ} ^{فَبَحِيهَلًا} ^{بِعَمْرٍ} [When the righteous are men-

may be imitated, as ضَرَبَ فَعَلَ مَاضٍ *Daraba is a preterite verb* and

بَحِيهَا يَزْجُونَ كُلَّ مَطِيَّةٍ * إِمَامَ الْمُطَلَا سِيرَهَا الْمُتَقَانِفِ

[by Muzāḥim al'Uḡailī, or, as is said (AAz), by An Nābigha alJa'dī, *With "Make haste" they drive on every riding-beast whose incessant journeying is before the riding-beasts* (IY, AAz)]; or may be declined with the cases of inflection [206], as

لَيْتَ شَعْرِي وَإِنِّي لَمِنَى لَيْتَ * إِنْ لَرَأَى إِنْ لَيْتَ عَنَاءَ

[by Abū Zubaid (H),] *Would that I knew—and where on my part is "Would that"? Verily "If" and verily "Would that" are a weariness* [200] and تَنَادِيَةٌ وَحِيَهْلَةٌ [above]. And sometimes حِيَهْلُكَ [560] is said (R). حَى and هَلْ are combined only for the sake of *intensiveness*; and, when you mean the original *call* without *intensiveness* (IY), حَى is used [alone (M)] in the sense of أَقْبَلَ, [made *trans.* by عَلَى (R),] as in [the saying of the Mu'adhdhin (M),] حَى عَلَى الصَّلَاةِ *Come to prayer* (M, R), which is only a *call* to prayer (IY): but, according to Akh, some of the Arabs say حِيَهْلُ الصَّلَاةِ *Come to prayer*; and حَى occurs *trans.* in the sense of إِيْتِ (R), whence

أَنشَأْتُ إِسْأَلَهُ مَا بَالُ رَفْقَتِهِ
حَى الْحَمُولِ فَإِنَّ الرُّكْبَ قَدْ ذَهَبَا

(IY, R), by Ibn Aḥmar (IY, MAR), *I commenced asking him what was the case of his fellow-travellers. "Come to the camels laden with litters: for verily the riders have gone"* (MAR): and [sometimes (IY)] هَلَّا [is used (AAz)] alone [in the sense of أَقْبَلَ and أَسْرَعَ (AAz)], as

أَلَا أَبْلَغَا لَيْلَى وَقُولَا لَهَا هَلَّا * لَقَدْ رَكِبْتَ أَمْرًا غَرًّا مَحْجَلًا
(M), by AnNābigħa alJa'dī (IY, AAz), satirizing Lailā al-Akhyaliya, *Now convey ye two (my message) to Lailā, and say to her, "Come up". (By God,) she has perpetrated a glaring, notorious matter, where هَلَّا contains a reproach and rebuke to her (AAz), i. e. أَقْبَلِي and قَعَالِي; but the use of حَى alone is more frequent than that of هَل alone (IY).*

§ 192. بَلَّةٌ is (1) a [verbal (M, R, DM)] *n.*, [i. q. دُعَ (IY, R, ML), i. e. أَتْرَكَ (DM), as زَيْدًا (IY, R), like دُعَ زَيْدًا (R)]: (2) an *inf. n.* (M, R, ML), i. q. التَّرَكَّى (M, ML), *pre.* (M) to what follows it (IY), as بَلَّةٌ زَيْدٌ [with prefixion to the *obj.* (R)], like تَرَكَّ زَيْدٌ (M, R), of the *cat.* of XLVII. 4. [188] (IY); and AZ relates that it

is transposed, when it is an *inf. n.*, as ^{زَيْدٌ} ^{يَهْلُ} (M): (3) as transmitted by F from Akh (R), a *n.* (ML) i. q. ^{كَيْفَ} : (a) what follows it is governed in [the *acc.* according to the 1st, the *gen.* according to the 2nd, and (ML)] the *nom.* according to the 3rd (R, ML): (b) its *Fath* is uninflectional according to the 1st and 3rd, and inflectional according to the 2nd (ML): (c) the saying [of Ka'b Ibn Mālik asṢaḥābī on the day of the Ditch (Jsh)]

تَذَرُ الْجَمَاجِمَ ضَاحِيًا هَامَاتَهَا * بَلَاءُ الْأَكْفِ كَانَهَا لَمْ تَخْلُقْ

[*They* (the *swords* mentioned in the preceding verse) *leave the skulls with their crowns laid bare, let alone the hands—or how then are the hands?—as though they had not been created* (Jsh)] is related with [^{الْأَكْفِ} in (IY, R) the *acc.* and *gen.* (M, R, ML) and *nom.* (R, ML) :

(d) when it is i. q. ^{كَيْفَ}, [says R (Dm),] ^{مِنْ} may be

prefixed to it [499] (R, Dm) : AZ transmits ^{أَنْ فَلَانًا لَا} ^{يُطِيقُ أَنْ يَحْمِلَ الْقَهْرَ فَمِنْ بَلَاءٍ أَنْ يَأْتِيَ بِالصَّخْرَةِ} *Verily such a one is not able to carry the stone : then how shall he be able to bring the rock?*, i. e. ^{كَيْفَ} (IY, R, Dm)

and ^{مِنْ أَيْنَ} *whence?* (R, Dm); and another version is

^{مِنْ يَهْلٍ} by transposition (IY, R) : (e) a strange circum-

stance is that the SB in the exposition of the ^{آلَمِ} of [the 32nd Chapter of the *Kur* named] ^{السَّجْدَةِ} contains [the

following words], " God says, ^{أَعَدَدْتُ} ^{لِعِبَادِي} ^{الصَّالِحِينَ} ^{مَا لَا عَيْنٌ رَأَتْ} ^{وَلَا أُذُنٌ سَمِعَتْ} ^{وَلَا خَطَرَ عَلَى قَلْبِ بَشَرٍ} ^{نُخْرًا} ^{مِنْ بَلَاءٍ} ^{مَا أَطَّلَعْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ} *I have made ready for My servants the righteous that which neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, and which hath not occurred to the mind of man, as a treasure, other than, or not, what ye have become acquainted with*", so that it is used *infl.*, governed in the *gen.* by ^{مِنْ}, and excluded from the three meanings [above mentioned] : but some expound it by ^{غَيْرِ}, which is plain ; and this corroborates those [vid. the KK and Bdd (DM)] who reckon it among the exceptive expressions (ML) : (f) this tradition is related with Fatḥ or the sign of the *gen.* in ^{بَلَاءٍ}, and in both cases with ^{مِنْ} : the version with the *gen.* has been explained by IHsh ; and in the version with Fatḥ ^{بَلَاءٍ} is [*uninfl.*,] i. q. ^{كَيْفَ}, and ^{مَا} infinitival, the *pron.* in ^{عَلَيْهِ} relating to the treasure, i. e. *How, and Whence, shall be your becoming acquainted with it ?* (Dm) : (4) as held by Akh, [and transmitted from him by IUK (Dm),] a *prep.* (IY, R, Dm), like ^{عَدَا} [512] (IY, R), ^{خَلَا} (R), and ^{حَاشَى} [511] (IY), i. q. ^{سَوَى} [89] ; and hence, as is said, the saying of the Prophet ^{بَلَاءٍ} ^{مَا أَطَّلَعْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ} *besides what I have acquainted them with* (R).

§ 193. فَعَال [uninfl. upon Kasr (Mb)] is [commonly held to be] always *fem.*, *det.*, and made to deviate from its proper form (Mb, IY). It is of 4 kinds, (1) [a verbal n. (Mb, IY, R), i. q. the *imp.* (M),] /like نَزَال *Alight* (Mb, M, R), i. q. اَنْزَلَ [187] (Mb, IY, R), دَرَاكَ *Overtake*, [i. q. اَدْرَكَ (IY),] and [بَدَا (IY)] بَدَا [said in battle (IY)], i. e. *Let each of you take his adversary* (M) : (a) according to S, it is universal in the *tril.* [below] (M, R), because of its frequency : but it is said [by Mb (R)] to be confined to hearsay, since no one may invent a form not spoken by the Arabs (IY, R), nor may we act upon analogy in the intensive forms ; while An says that Mb's disallowance is strong ; and therefore it is better to interpret what S says by supposing that by *universality* he means *frequency*, so that فَعَال is quasi-regular because of its frequency (R) : فَعَال as an *imp.* does not occur in the Revelation, except in the reading of AlHasan لَا مَسَاسِي XX. 97. *Touch me not* [below], which in the prefixion of لَ to the verbal n. is like their saying to the stumbler, when they imprecate upon him that he may not recover his footing, [لَا (MAd)] لَا مَاسِي *Mayst thou not recover thy footing !* (Sh) : (c) it is rare in the *quad.* (M) ; and is then فَعَال, not فَعَال (IY) : they are

agreed that (R) only two words of it occur in the *quad.*,
vid. قَرَقَر (IY, R), i. e. قَرَقَر (IY), as

قَالَتْ لَهُ رِيحُ الْأَصْبَا قَرَقَر * وَاخْتَلَطَ الْمَعْرُوفُ بِالْأَنْكَارِ

[*The bréeze of the east wind said to it (the cloud) "Rum-
ble (with thunder)" : and the ground wet with rain be-
came bleuded with the dry (AAz)*]; and [عَرَعَار (IY, R),
i. e. *Play at العرعة*, which is a game of theirs (R)], as

مُتَكَنِّفِي جَنْبِي عَكَاطُ كُلِيهِمَا * يَدْعُو بِهَا وَلَدَانَهُمْ عَرَعَارُ

(M, R), by AnNābigha adhDhubayānī, *Surrounding the
two sides of 'Ukāz, both of them, while their lads call
out in it, Play at العرعة* (ABk): Mb says that deviation

[from the *imp. v.* to the *imp. verbal n.*] does not occur
in the *quad.* at all, قَرَقَر being only an *imitation of the
sound of thunder*, and عَرَعَار an *imitation of the cries of
boys*, as غَاقِي غَاقِي [200] is said; but Sf replies that what
S says is better, because in *imitation of sound* the 1st
does not differ from the 2nd, as غَاقِي غَاقِي, so that, if they

meat *imitation*, they would say قَرَقَر and عَرَعَار; while,
according to Akh [in the Book of Etymology (AAz)],

فُعَالِل as an *imp. [verbal n.]* from the *quad.* is regular,
[because *intensiveness* is not peculiar to the *tril.* (AAz)]:

(d) the GG hold that this فُعَالِل is made to deviate from

the verbal *imp.* for the sake of *intensiveness*, this intensive form for the *imp.* being like the intensive **نَزَّلَ** and **أَنْزَلَ** for **فَعَّلَ** : Jj says “ the *o. f.* of **نَزَّلَ** is **أَنْزَلَ**, 3 or more ; and, 3 or more being *pl.*, and the *pl.* being *fem.*, **أَنْزَلِي** is said : they affix the **ي**, which is the *pron.* of the *fem.*, to the *v.* as an indication of the triple repetition, as they affix the **ل** in **أَلْقِيَا فِي جَهَنَّمَ** L. 23. “ *Cast, cast thou into Hell* [233] as an indication of the double repetition, its *o. f.* being **أَلْقِيَا**, [like **يَا** “ **حَرَسِي** (607) (K)] ; and what is meant by the repetition is *intensiveness* : and afterwards they make **نَزَّلَ** deviate from **أَنْزَلِي**, so that **نَزَّلَ** is then *fem.*, like **أَنْزَلِي** ; and the evidence of the feminization of the *imp.* **نَزَّلَ** is the saying [of Zuhair (Abl)]

وَلَأَنْتَ أَشَجَعُ مِنْ أَسَمَةَ إِذْ * دُعِيَ نَزَّالٌ وَلَجَّ فِي الدَّعْرِ

“ *And assuredly thou art braver than the lion when Alight has been called out, and fright has been excited* ” : but, in my opinion, the verbal *n.*'s being made to deviate from the form of the *v.* is a thing that they have no evidence of ; and, the general rule being that every [expression] made to deviate from some thing does not pass out of the species to which that thing belongs, the *v.* cannot by deviation pass from the quality of *v.* to that of *n.* : and,

as for the *intensiveness*, it exists in all the verbal *ns.*, as we explained before [187], not in the manner asserted by Jj; and the feminization of the *v.* in دُعِيَتْ نَزَالٍ does not prove the *o. f.* of نَزَالٍ to be an *imp. v.* repeated, but is due to the paraphrase of نَزَالٍ by the كَلِمَةٌ or لَفْظَةٌ or دَعْوَةٌ: (e) similarly the 2 kinds of the *inf. n.* and *ep.* are not devoid of the sense of *intensiveness* [194], so that حَمَادٌ and كَنَاعٌ are more intensive than الْحَمْدُ and لِكْنَعٌ (R): (2) made to deviate from (Mb), [and therefore] in the sense of (M), a [*det. (M) fem. (IY)*] *inf. n.* (Mb, M, R), being a proper name for it (IY), like فَجَارٌ *Wickedness* [a proper name (IY)] for الْفَجْرَةُ [8], جَمَادٌ for الْجُمُودُ [below], and حَمَادٌ for الْمُحَمَّدَةُ (M), as

إِنَّا أَقْتَسَمْنَا خَطَايَنَا بَيْنَنَا * فَحَمَلْتُ بَرَّةً وَاحْتَمَلْتُ فَجَارَ

by AnNābigha [adhDhubyānī (Mb, ABk), *Verily we have divided our qualities between us; and I have borne off goodness, and thou hast carried away wickedness* (ABk), i. e. الْفَجْرَةُ (IY)], and

جَمَادٌ لَهَا جَمَادٌ وَلَا تَقُولِي * طَوَالَ الدَّهْرِ مَا ذُكِرْتُ حَمَادٌ

[by AlMutalammis (Akh, IY), *blaming wine* (Akh),]

“*Stagnation*” (say thou) to it, “*stagnation*”; and say thou not (to it), throughout the length of time, so long as

it is mentioned, "Praise," i. e. قَوْلِي لَهَا جُمُودًا وَلَا تَقُولِي لَهَا
حَمْدًا (Mb, IY), this being the sense, though it is made to
deviate as a [det.] fem. [above] (Mb): and hence بَدَادٌ ,
as in

وَذَكَرْتُ مِنْ لَبِي الْمَصَلَقِ شَرْبَةً * وَالْخَيْلُ تَعْدُو فِي الصَّعِيدِ بَدَادٍ
[below], by 'Auf [Ibn 'Atīya (KF)] Ibn AlKhari' ['Amr
Ibn 'Abs (KF)], *And thou rememberedst a draught of the
milk of the herd of camels branded with a mark like a
ring, when the horses were running on the surface of the
ground dispersed*, i. e. بَدَادٌ i. q. مُتَبَدِّدَةٌ, an inf. n. i. q.
the act. part., like عَادِلٌ i. q. عَادِلٌ [76, 143], being really
a [generic proper] name for a det. fem. inf. n., like الْبَدَّةُ ,
even if such an inf. n. has not been spoken, as though
it were an abandoned o. f.; and similarly in

كُنَّا ثَمَانِيَةً وَكَانُوا جَحْفَلًا * لَجِبًا فَشَكُوا بِالرِّمَاحِ بَدَادٍ

by Ḥassān [Ibn Thābit, describing the day of Dhū Ḳarad
(SR)], *We were eight, and they were a noisy host:
and they were pierced with the spears, when dispersed*,

i. e. مُتَبَدِّدِينَ; for the d. s. may occur det. when it is
an inf. n., as اِرْسَلَهَا الْعِرَاقَ and طَاقَتَكَ and فَعَلَتْهُ جَهْدُكَ

[78] (IY): (a) they say "[made to deviate from (AAz)]
a det. fem. inf. n.": but to me no decisive evi-
dence of its determination or feminization has yet

أَب meaning لَا نَزَاعَ إِلَيْهِ, and the saying of AlMutalammis قُولِي لَهَا جُمُودًا أَخ [as above], and the saying of the Arabs لَا مَسَاسِي No touching! [above], i. e. لَا مَسِي, the indeterminateness is obvious : (d) according to those who hold that all the measures of فَعَال, *imp.*, *inf. n.*, *ep.*, and proper name, are *fem.*, they must, when used as [proper] names for a *masc.* [194], be diptote, like عَنَّا; whereas, according to the GG, they may be triptote, like صَبَّاح; and this shows how the GG vacillate about their being *fem.* (R) : (3) made to deviate from (M) a [*fem.* (IY, R) prevalent (Mb, IY)] *ep.*, [which occupies the place of a substantive (149) (Mb) : this *ep.* does not occur in the *masc.*, is always used without a qualified, and is moreover of two kinds (R),] (a) used [(a) in most cases (IY) only (IY, R)] in the *voc.*, [according to hearsay (R),] as يَا فَسَّاق [56. A], يَا خَبِيل, and يَا لَكَاع (Mb, M, R), i. e. يَا فَاسَقَّة, يَا خَبِيئَتُ, and يَا لَكَعَاء (Mb, R), because in the *voc.* it is in the position of a *det.* (Mb), since the *voc.* becomes *det.* by specific intention, like يَا رَجُل in رَجُل [48] ; (b) sometimes in the *non-voc.*, by poetic license, as أَطَرَف [497] (IY) : (a) this فَعَال and the *imp.* فَعَال may be formed with universal regularity from every *trit.* [above] *att.*

[completely (MKh) plastic (MKh, MAd)] *v.*, as نَزَالٌ, نُهَابٌ, and كُتَبٌ from نَزَلَ, نَهَبَ, and كَتَبَ, and as زَنَى, فَجَرَ, فَسَقَ from يَا زَنَاءَ, يَا فَجَارَ, and يَا فَسَاقَ: but not from such as اللِّصَوِصِيَّةُ, because it has no *v.*; nor from such as دُحْرَجٌ, اسْتَخْرَجَ, and انْطَلَقَ, because they exceed three letters, [such as ادْرَكَ from دَرَاكَ being confined to hearsay (MKh)]; nor from such as ظَلَّ, كَانَ, بَلَّ, and صَارَ, because they are *non-att.* (Sh); nor from such as نَعَمَ and بَيْتَسَ, [because they are aplastic] (MAd); nor from such as يَذَرُ and يَدَعُ [482], because they are not completely plastic (MKh): (β) this kind, which is used only in the *voc.*, does not occur as a generic proper name [7], i. e. does not, by prevalence of application to a [particular] qualified, become a proper name for it (R): (b) used in the *non-voc.*, [which is of two kinds, (a) what by prevalence of application becomes a generic proper name, like اسَامَةُ (7), which is the more numerous (R),] as حَلَاثِي [and جَبَانٌ (M, R)] for *Fate* (Mb, M, R), made to deviate from حَالَقَةٌ and جَابِذَةٌ (AAz), *orig.* general *eps.* for all that *shears* and *drags away*, and afterwards, by prevalence of application, peculiar to the genus of *The Fates*

(R) ; and [similarly (R)] حَنَانٌ and بَرَّاحٌ for *The sun* [from
 الحَنَنُ *roasting* and البَرَّاحُ *setting* (R)] ; and سَبَامَةٌ for *Fever*,
 [because of its *spreading* through the body, from الشَّعْرُ
 السَّابِطُ *Lank hair* (R)] ; and [many others, like (R)] كَرَارٌ
 for *The bead that the woman charms her husband with* !,
 [which is named كَرَارٌ because by their assertion it re-
 stores the husband (R),] whence their saying يَا كَرَارُ كَرِّبِ
 اِنْ اَدْبَرَ فَرْدِيهِ وَاِنْ اَقْبَلَ فَسِّرِيهِ O charm, restore him : if
 he depart, bring him back ; and, if he approach, make
 him glad ; and وَقَّاعٌ كَوَيْتَهُ وَقَّاعٌ I branded him with the وَقَّاعُ,
 which is [the proper name of (R)] a [particular (AAz)]
 brand upon the two haunches (M, R), or along the head
 from its front to its back (M), in the acc. as an *inf. n.* to
 كَوَيْتَهُ, i. e. كَيْتَهُ وَاقَعَهُ meaning لَازِمَةٌ (R), whence

وَكُنْتُ اِذَا مَنِيْتُ بِخَصْمٍ سَوٍّ * دَلَفْتُ لَهُ فَكَوَيْتُهُ وَقَّاعٌ

(M), by 'Auf Ibn ALAḥwaṣ (IY, AAz), *And I was wont,*
when I was tried by a foe of evil, to stalk up to him, and
brand him indelibly (AAz) ; and جَعَارٌ, [قَتَامٌ, and فَشَاحٌ
 (R)] for the *she-hyena* [below] (Mb, R) : these [expres-
 sions (IY), and their likes (R), (among which IY in-
 cludes those given below under (b) except بَدَادٌ, which
 he places above among the *inf. ns.*), though *orig. eps.*

(IY),] are [used as (IY) generic (R)] proper names (IY, R); and are therefore *det.* (IY), as is proved by their qualification by the *det.*, as حَنَازُ الصَّالَةِ *The rising sun* (R): and [(b) what remains an *ep.* (R),] as قَطَامٌ, [i. e. قَاطَةٌ كَافِيَةٌ (R),] whence

أَطَلْتُ فِرَاطَهُمْ حَتَّىٰ إِنَّمَا * قَدَّمْتُ سَرَائِهِمْ كَانَتْ قَطَامًا

[by 'Amr Ibn Ma'dikarib, when his mother had been killed by a tribe of the Arabs; *I prolonged* the period of my forbearance with *their hasty deed*, until, when *I had slain their chiefs*, it (the قَتْلَةٌ slaughter) was sufficient for me (AAz)]; and سَبَبْتُ سَبَبًا تَكُونُ لَزَامٌ *I reproached him with a reproach that will be indelible*, i. e. لَزِمَةٌ; and لَا تَبِلُ فَلَانًا عِنْدِي بَلَالٌ, i. e. بَالَةٌ (M, R), meaning *A bounty shall not light upon such an one near me, nor a benefit reach him from me*; and وَالْخَيْلُ تَعْدُو الْغُ [above], i. e. مَتَبَدِّدَةٌ مَتَفَرِّقَةٌ, so that it is a *d. s.* [78, 140] (R): (4) made to deviate from فَاعِلَةٌ in (M) a [personal (R) proper (M, R)] name [of a woman or *fem.* thing (Mb)], as حَنَازٌ [194], قَطَامٌ (Mb, M, R), رَقَاشٌ (Mb), سَجَاحٌ (R), and the like, made to deviate from خَازِمَةٌ, قَاطِمَةٌ, etc., when used as names (Mb) for [certain (R)] women (M, R), سَجَاحٌ

being for the *woman* [of the Banū Yarbū' (IY)] *who set up for a Prophetess* (M) in the time of Musailima (IY); كَسَاب [6] and خَطَاف for 2 *bitches* (M, R); قَتَام , جَعَار , and فَشَاح for the *she-hyena* [above]; خَصَاف and سَكَاب for 2 *horses* (M), خَصَاف for a *stallion*, as in the *prov.* أَجْرًا *Bolder than the gelder of Khaṣāf*, because one of the kings [AlMundhir Ibn Imra alKais (KF)] demanded him for covering from his owner [a man of Bāhila, said by Abu-nNadā to have been Hamal Ibn Yazīd Ibn Dhuhl Ibn Tha'laba (Md)], who refused and castrated him [in the presence of that king (Md)], and سَكَاب for a *mare* (R); عَرَار for a *cow* (M, R), as in the *prov.* [applied to every pair of equals (Md, IY)] بَاوَتْ عَرَارٍ بِكَحْلٍ, *Arāri was slain for Kaḥl* (M); they being 2 *cows* that gored each other to death (Md, IY); وَبَار and شَوَاف for 2 *countries*; and لَصَاف (M, R) for a *mountain* (M), an *abode of the Banū Tamīm* (IY, R), as قَدْ كُنْتُ الْخ [below]: (a) this kind [of proper name] is coined [4,194] because it is not made to deviate before its use as a proper name corresponding to an object, and afterwards transferred to the *cat.* of proper name; and the difference between this kind and the preceding one [3, b, a] is that in this kind the sense of *qualificativity* is lost sight of, whereas in the preceding one *qualificativity* is meant [194] (IY): (b) all (R) these expressions

are *fem.* (Mb, R), even if the [person or thing] named by them be *masc.*; and in the saying

قَدْ كُنْتُ أَحْسِبُكُمْ إِسْرَدَ خَفِيَّةٍ * فَإِذَا لَصَافٍ تَبْيَضُ فِيهِ الْحُمْرُ

*I have been wont to account you to be lions of a thicket ;
and lo ! in Laṣāf the larks lay eggs !* the pron. of لَصَافٍ

is made *masc.* because it is renderable by the مَوْضِعْ ; and

there is another version فِيهَا , [as in the Bk and IY] :

(c) sometimes such *fems.* as these are used as names for a man, like سَعَادُ and زَيْنَبُ (R).

§ 194. IM says in the Tashīl “They are agreed
“that [the ʾ of] فَعَالٌ , when an *imp.*, *inf. n.*, *d. s.*, or
“*ep.* used as a proper name or only as a *voc.*, is pro-
“nounced with Kasr ; and each of them is made to deviate
“from a *fem.*: so that, if one of them be used as a [pro-
“per] name for a *masc.* [193], it is like عَنَّاظٌ”, i. e.
diptote ; “but is sometimes made like صَبَاحٌ”, i. e. trip-
tote: “and, if it be used as a [proper] name for a *fem.*,
“it is like رَقَاشِي [193]” (YS). [The ʾ of] فَعَالٌ in the
imp. is pronounced with Fath by the Banū Asad (R, Sh),
for affinity to the ʾ and Fatha before it (Sh). The *inf.*
ns. and *eps.* are *uninfl.* by common consent, because
of their resemblance to the *imp.* فَعَالٌ [159] in *measure*
and *intensiveness* [193]. The generic proper names

ought to be *infl.*, because the *uninfl.* word, when used as a [proper] name for something other than its form, must be *infl.*, as when a person is named ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ; [and may not be imitated, as when it is used as a (proper) name for the form (191): because in the former case you do not observe its original meaning, on account of which it is *orig. uninfl.*, but totally exclude it therefrom, whereas, when you make it a (proper) name for the form, you do observe its meaning in some respect, since the meaning of ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ ^{٩٨٤}أَيْنِ, whose meaning is *verification, governs the nom. and acc.* (R on the proper name)] : but they are *uninfl.* because the generic proper names [7] are [only] *lit.* proper names, [which have the predicament of proper names in letter, such as diptote declension, anarthrousness, and prefixion of ^{٩٨٤}أَم and ^{٩٨٤}أَب, as in the surnames of human beings, and occur as *ss. s* and are qualified by *dets.*, but notwithstanding all this are applicable to the *indel.* (R on the proper name)] ; so that the sense of *qualification* remains in all of them [193], since they are prevalent *quals.* (R). As for the [personal (R)] proper names [of *fems.*, they have 3 *dial. vars.* (Sh):] (1) according to the people of AlHijāz, they are *uninfl.* (R, Sh) upon Kasr, unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether they end in *ر* or not (YS),] as

إِذَا قَالَتْ حَذَامٌ فَصَدَّقُوهَا * فَإِنَّ الْقَوْلَ مَا قَالَتْ حَذَامٌ

(Sh), by Lujaim Ibn Ṣa'b, *When Ḥadhām* (the wife of the poet) *says a saying, then believe ye her: for verily the true saying is what Ḥadhām has said* (Jsh): their making these names *uninfl.* is contrary to analogy, since *qualification* has no meaning in them, so that the *uninflectedness* belonging to them in the state of *qualification* might be observed; but, seeing that there is no contradiction between *qualification* and the *quality of proper name* as respects the sense, they make them *uninfl.* like the *quals.*, although they are coined [193], not transferred from *quals.*, in order to treat them like the proper name transferred from the *qual.*, because it is more numerous than the other (R): (2) according to a few of the Banū Tamīm, they are *infl.* as diptotes (R, Sh), *unrestrictedly* (Sh), in conformity with analogy, being *infl.* because denuded of the sense of *qualification*, and diptote because of the *quality of proper name* and *femininization* in them [18] (R): (3) according to most of them [and to their chaste speakers (R)], they are *uninfl.* [upon Kasr (Sh), with a view to Imāla (634) (R),] if they end in ر; and diptote if they do not end in ر (R, Sh): the poet says مَتَى تَرَبَّنَ الْعَم [64]; and AlA'shā [Maimūn Ibn Kais (MAd), whose abode was in AlYamāma with the Banū Tamīm (IY),] says, combining the two Tamīm *dials.*,

أَلَمْ تَرَوْا أَرْمًا وَعَادًا * أَوْبَىٰ بِهَا اللَّيْلُ وَالنَّهَارُ
وَمَرَّ دَهْرٌ عَلَىٰ وَبَارٍ * فَهَلَكْتَ جَهْرَةً وَبَارٍ

(Sh) *Saw ye not Iram and 'Ād ? The night and the day destroyed them. And a time passed over Wabār, and Wabār perished openly* (AAz).

§ 195. هَيْهَاتَ is pronounced with Fath of the ه [in the *dial.* of the people of AlHijāz (M)], Kasr [in the *dial.* of Asad and Tamīm (M)], and Damm [by some of the Arabs (M)]. Sometimes its [1st (R, AAz)] ه is changed into Hamza, [also with triple vocalization of the ه (R)]; and sometimes it is pronounced with Tanwīn (M, R) in these 6 *dial. vars.* (R). It is read with all 3 vowels [in XXIII. 38. (504), with and without Tanwīn (K, B) : for Fath is the general well-known reading, and with Tanwīn is transmitted from AlA'raj ; Kasr without Tanwīn is the reading of Abū Ja'far athThakafi, and with Tanwīn is read by IIU ; and Damm with Tanwīn is the reading of Abū Haiwa, and without Tanwīn is said to be read by Ka'nab (IY)]: the poet says

تَذَكَّرْتُ أَيَّامًا مَضِيَّةً مِنْ الصَّبِيِّ
هَيْهَاتَ هَيْهَاتَ إِلَيْكَ رُجُوعَهَا

[*Thou hast called to mind days of boyhood that have passed : then far, far off is their return to thee !* (AAz)]: and the saying of the poet [describing camels (IY)]

يُصْبِحُنَّ بِالْقَفَرِ نَارِيَاتٍ * هَيْهَاتَ مِنْ مُصْبِحِهَا هَيْهَاتَ

[*They become in the desert wending their way : far, far off is their place, or time, of entering upon the morning !*,

هَيَّاهُ being red. (AAz),] is related with Damm of the 1st and Kasr of the 2nd (M). Some make the ت quiescent

[even in continuity (R), as هَيَّاهُ هَيَّاهُ, which is read

{in XXIII. 38. (K, B)} by 'Isā alHamdānī, and is a version transmitted from IAl (IY)]; some elide the ت ,

[as هَيَّاهُ (IY, R) ; some make it a ن (M), as هَيَّاهُ

(IY)]; and some say أَيَّاهُ, [أَيَّاهُ with Tanwīn (R),] أَيَّاهُ

[with the ك of allocution (IY, R)], and أَيَّاهُ (M, R)

with a Hamza and ن both pronounced with Fath, but, as the author of the Mughnī says, with a ن pronounced

with Kasr (R). Sgh cites 36 dial. vars. of it, هَيَّاهُ and

أَيَّاهُ, هَيَّاهُ and أَيَّاهُ, and هَيَّاهُ and أَيَّاهُ, each of

these six pronounced with Damm, Fath, or Kasr of the final, and each [of these 18] pronounced with or without

Tanwīn ; and others cite هَيَّاهُ and أَيَّاهُ, هَيَّاهُ and

أَيَّاهُ, and هَيَّاهُ and أَيَّاهُ (A), making the total 42 ; and the

KF adds 13 others, هَيَّاهُ and أَيَّاهُ, and هَيَّاهُ and

أَيَّاهُ, with Kasr of the ي because of the 2 quiescents,

and with triple vocalization of the final, and أَيَّاهُ with

charge of the two ʾs into Hamzas (Sn). According to

[some of (R)] the GG, (1) the one pronounced with Fath [of the ت (IY, R)] is *sing.* [646], its ت denoting *femininization*, and its *o. f.* being هِهْيَئَة; (2) the one pronounced with Kasr [of the ت (R)] is the [sound (IY)] *pl.* of the one pronounced with Fath, its *o. f.* being هِهْيَات [234], and its ج being then elided (M, R), because it is *indecl.*; (3) the one pronounced with Damm of the ت may be *sing.* or *pl.*: but this is all imagination and conjecture. The ت is pronounced with Fath in most cases, from regard to its *o. f.* when it was an unrestricted *obj.* [187, 199]; with Kasr because of the two quiescents [664]; and with Damm to notify by the strength of the vowel the strength of the meaning of *farness* in it, since its meaning is *How far (he, or it) is!* [187] (R). When pronounced with Damm, it is written, according to F, with the ت; but, according to IJ, with the ڤ (A).

§ 196. شَتَانُ is i. q. اِفْتَرَقَ [187] with *wonder*, i. e. *How different!*; and therefore requires two *ags.*, like اِفْتَرَقَ شَتَانُ زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو as شَتَانُ زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو *How different are Zaid and Amr!* (R). مَا may be redundantly inserted [after it (R), before the *ag.* (Sh), as شَتَانُ مَا زَيْدٌ وَعَمْرُو (565) (R), whence

شَتَانُ مَا نَرْمِي عَلَى كُورِهَا * وَنَرْمِ حَيَّانَ أَخِي جَابِرٍ

(Sh), by Al A'shà, *How different are my sleep upon her saddle in the desert and the sleep of Hayyān the brother of Jābir !* (MAd)]. And شَتَانُ مَا بَيْنَ زَيْدٍ وَعَمْرٍو is said [in the less frequent and less chaste usage (R)], as

لَشَتَانُ مَا بَيْنَ الْيَزِيدِيِّ فِي النَّدَى
يَزِيدٍ سَلِيمٍ وَالْأَعْرَابِيِّ حَاتِمٍ

(R, Sh), by Rabi'a [Ibn Thābit alAsadi (IKhn)] arRakki, [(By God,) *how different are, or how far is that (distance) which is between* (MKh), *or how far is the separation of* (MAd), *the two Yazīds in munificence* (MKh, MAd), *Yazīd Ibn Usaid of Sulaim and the illustrious Yazīd Ibn Hātim* (MAd) alMuhallabī! (IY, IKhn),] this being allowable upon the ground that [مَا بَيْنَ is red., and الْيَزِيدِيُّ an ag. constructively in the nom.; or that (MKh)] شَتَانُ is i. q. بَعْدُ, because the latter does not require two or more ags., and مَا [conjunct (MKh),] a met. for الْبُؤْسُ or الْمَسَافَةُ, [ag. of شَتَانُ (MKh),] i. e. *How far is that (interval or distance) which is between them !*; or that شَتَانُ is i. q. بَعْدُ, and مَا red., as it is without بَيْنَ, and بَيْنَ ag. of شَتَانُ, in accordance with the opinion of Akh on يَفْصَلُ بَيْنَكُمْ LX. 3. *Your union shall be severed*, where بَيْنَكُمْ [159], says he, is the subject, but is not put into the

nom. from disapproval of its exclusion from the *acc.* permanently belonging to it in most of its usage (R). It is disallowed, however, by As (R, Sh), who says that the poem is post-classical, because he holds that شَتَّانٌ is *du.* of شَتَّ separate, an *enunc.* of what follows it, [not a verbal *n. i. q.* اِفْتَرَقَ (YS, MAd),] he being misled by two things, a *dial. var.* with Kasr of the ش [187] and the fact that the *nom.* after it is only a *du.* or *i. q.* the *du.*, not a *pl.*, [the last three in شَتَّانٌ هَذَا الْخ (187) being in the predicament of one, i. e. شَتَّانٌ هَذَا وَذَاكَ (AAz)]; whereas, if it were *i. q.* اِفْتَرَقَ, the *pl.* might occur as *ag.* of it: but the chaster *dial. var.* with Fath of the ش falsifies his opinion; and also, if شَتَّانٌ were an *enunc.*, it might be posterior to the *inch.*, since there is nothing to necessitate its priority [28], whereas it has not been heard posterior (R). But, as for the saying of a post-classical poet

جَازَيْتُمُونِي بِالْوَصَالِ قَطِيعَةً * شَتَّانٌ بَيْنَ صَنِيعِكُمْ وَصَنِيعِي

[Ye have requited me for union with estrangement: how far is the separation of your dealing and my dealing? بَيْنَ being *ag.* of شَتَّانٌ, the construction in (MAd)] it was not used by the Arabs; and it is sometimes explained by subaudition of مَا conjoined with بَيْنَ, [i. e.

how far is that (distance) which is between your etc. (MKh), م being an *ag.* (MAd),] according to the saying of the KK that suppression of the conjunct [*n.* other than اَلْ (MAd)] is allowable [177] (Sh).

§ 197. اِف has the following *dial. vars.*, (1) اِف ; (2) اِف ; (3) اِف ; (4) اِف ; (5) اِف [187]; (6) اِف (M, R, KF); (7) اِف ; (8) اِف (M, R), sometimes followed by تَف , as اِف و تَف (R); (9) اِف (M); (10) اِف (R); but I do not know اِف [41] with the ة of femininization [as a verbal *n.*]; and, if it does occur, how rare it is! (IY); (11) اِف (KF); (12) اِف (IY, KF), read by Ibn 'Abbās (IY); (13) اِف ; (14) اِف ; (15) اِف ; (16) اِف ; (17) اِف (KF); (18) اِف ; (19-21) اِف [with the ا of femininization (IY, KF), upon the measure of فَعْلَى (IY),] pronounced [without Imāla (KF),] with [pure (KF)] Imāla (IY, R, KF), and betwixt and between (KF); (22) اِف (IY, KF) with Kasr (KF), said by the vulgar (IY); (23) اِف ; (24) اِف ; (25) اِف ; (26) اِف ; (27) اِف (KF); (28) اِف (R, KF); (29) اِف ; (30) اِف ; (31) اِف ; (32) اِف ; (33) اِف ; (34) اِف ; (35) اِف ; (36) اِف ; (37) اِف , like اِف ;

(38) اَفِي with Imāla ; (39) اَفِي with Kasr ; (40) اَف ; (41) اَف ; (42) اَف ; (43) اَف ; (44) اَف (KF). It is *uninfl.* upon Kasr because of the concurrence of two quiescents ; and its Tanwīn in the reading of Nāfi' and Ḥafṣ denotes *indeterminateness* [198] : Ibn Kathīr, Ibn 'Āmir, and Ya'qūb read with Fath, by way of alleviation ; and it is so read with Tanwīn : and it is read with Damm for alliteration, like مَنذُ [203], with and without Tanwīn (B on XVII. 24).

§ 198. IM says in the CK that, since these words are *vs.* as respects the sense, but *ns.* as respects the letter, they are made *det.* and *indet.*, the sign of the *det.* being its divestment of Tanwīn [187], and the sign of the *indet.* being its use with Tanwīn ; and that, since pure *ns.* are [of three kinds,] always *det.*, like the *prons.* and *dems.*, always *indet.*, like أَحَدٌ , عَرِيبٌ , and دِيَارٌ , and sometimes *det.* and sometimes *indet.*, like رَجُلٌ and فَرَسٌ , so (A) these *ns.* are [of three kinds (M),] (1) always *det.*, like [نَزَالٌ (193) (A),] بَلَّةٌ [192], and آمِينٌ [187] : (2) always *indet.*, like [يَهْأ in *restraint* (M),] وَيَهْأ [in *instigation* (M),] and وَهْأ [187] (M, A) in *wonder* ; and hence فِدَاءٌ لَكَ فُلَانٌ with Kasr and Tanwīn, i. e. لِيَقْدِكَ , as

مَهْلًا فِدَاءَ لَكَ الْأَقْوَامُ كُلُّهُمْ * وَمَا أَثْمَرُ مِنْ مَالٍ وَمِنْ وَلَدٍ

(M), by AnNābigha adhDhubyānī, *Gently, let the peoples, all of them, and what I muster of wealth and of children, ransom thee!* (ABk), ^{أَلَا تَرَاهُ} being in the *nom.* as *ag.* of ^{فَدَاكَ}, because it is i. q. ^{أَيُّفَدَكَ} (IY) : (a) ^{أَيُّهَا} may be an *ej.* acting as a substitute for the *inf. n.*, *infl.*, governed in the *acc.* like ^{سَقِيَا} [41], meaning ^{كُفَا}, [in which case the Tanwīn is the Tanwīn of complete declension,] as ^{عَنَا} ^{أَيُّهَا} *Desist from troubling us* ; or a verbal *n. uninfl.*, in which case the Tanwīn is [the Tanwīn of indeterminateness,] like that which is in ^{صَمَ} [below] : and similarly every Tanwīn after such of these *n.* as are pronounced with *Fath* [of the final] admits of the two alternatives, as ^{وَيَدَا} [188], ^{حَيَّهَا} [191], and ^{وَيَدَا} (R) : (b) IS says that ^{أَيُّهَا} without Tanwīn is allowable, but rare (IY, R) : (c) sometimes the Hamza of ^{أَيُّهَا} [below] and ^{أَيُّهَا} is changed into ^{هَ}, as ^{هَيَّهَا} and ^{هَيَّهَا} (R) : (d) ^{فَدَاكَ} is *uninfl.* because of its occurrence in the place of the *imp. v.* [159], i. e. ^{أَيُّفَدَكَ} ; and is pronounced with *Kasr* because of the concurrence of two quiescents [664] (IY) : (3) used in two ways (A), *det.* and *indet.* (M), being divested of Tanwīn when intended to be *det.*, and pronounced with Tanwīn when intended to be *indet.* (A), like ^{صَمَ} and ^{صَمَ} [187, 200], ^{أَفَ} and ^{أَفَ} [197] (M,

A), اِيْه and اِيْه [187, 200], غَاق and غَاق [200] (M): (a) As asserts that the Arabs use only اِيْه with Tanwīn, and charges Dhu-rRumma with error in saying قَفْنَا [187] (IY, R); and IS says that he intends Tanwīn, since his meaning is *Tell a story, whatever story it be, about Umm Sālim*, but that he omits it by poetic license (R). The Tanwīn affixed to these *ejs.* only distinguishes between the *det.* and *indet.* [608], not being found in a *det.* at all; and only follows the vowels of uninflectedness, not being like the Tanwīn of زَيْد [and رَجُل], which follows the vowels of inflection in the *det.* and *indet.* (IY). What IM mentions [above] is the well-known opinion; but some hold that all the verbal *ns.*, with or without Tanwīn, are *det.* with the determination of the generic proper name [187] (A).

§ 199. Among the verbal *ns.* are *adv.* and their likes, governing in the *gen.* a *pron.* mostly of the 2nd *pers.*, anomalously and seldom of the 3rd, as in the saying عَلَيْهِ شَخْصًا لَيْسَنِي [164] and the saying of the Prophet مَنِ اشْتَهَى مِنْكُمْ الْبَاءَةَ فَعَلَيْهِ بِالصَّوْمِ فَإِنَّ لَهُ رِجَاءً *Whoso of you lusteth after copulation, let him keep to fasting, for verily it hath the effect of gelding by compression of the two testicles* (R). IM says in the CK that this sort is not used except conjoined with the *pron.* of the 2nd

pers.; and that ^{رَجُلًا} عَلَيْهِ ^{أَيُّ} i. q. ^{لِيَلْزَمَ} [164], ^{أَلَيْ} عَلَى الشَّيْءِ i. q. ^{أَتَنْحَى} are anomalous: but his language in the Tashīl implies that these are not anomalous (A). ^{عِنْدَكَ}, ^{لَدَيْكَ}, and ^{دُونَكَ} mean *Take*. The *o. f.* is ^{عِنْدَكَ} ^{زَيْدٌ} فَخُذْهُ *Beside thee is Zaid: then take him*, and similarly ^{لَدَيْكَ} ^{زَيْدٌ} and ^{دُونَكَ} ^{زَيْدٌ}, what follows them being put into the *nom.* as an *inch.*; but afterwards it is abridged from the nominal and subsequent verbal *prop.* to the *adv.*, which is then so often used that it becomes i. q. ^{خُذْ}, and therefore governs with its government: while the *adv.* are *uninfl.* upon *Fath̄*, because it is the vowel appropriate to them in their *o. f.* when they were *adv.*, as we said of the *inf. ns.* that become verbal *ns.* [188, 195]; and they have no place [in inflection], like those *inf. ns.*, because they act as substitutes for what has no place [187] (R). ^{وَرَاكَ} means *Keep back*, and ^{أَمَامَكَ} *Advance* (R, A) or *Be on thy guard from the direction of thy front*: but these may be said to remain *adv.*, since they do not govern an *obj.* in the *acc.* [but see § 187], like ^{عِنْدَكَ} and ^{لَدَيْكَ}; and in that case the full phrase is ^{أَسْتَقِرَّ} ^{عِنْدَكَ} and ^{أَسْتَقِرَّ} ^{لَدَيْكَ}; and in that case the full phrase is ^{أَسْتَقِرَّ} ^{عِنْدَكَ} and ^{أَسْتَقِرَّ} ^{لَدَيْكَ} [498] (R). And ^{مَكَانَكَ} means ^{أَثْبَتْ} ^{مَكَانَكُمْ} ^{أَنْتُمْ} [420] (IY, A), so that it is *intrans.* (Sn), as ^{أَثْبَتْ} ^{مَكَانَكُمْ} ^{أَنْتُمْ}

ag.; and Akh heard ^{عَلَى} ^{عَبْدِ} ^{اللَّهِ} ^{زَيْدًا} meaning *Bring Zaid near to 'Abd Allāh*, which is more anomalous than ^{عَلَى}, because ^{عَلَى} governs the explicit *n.* in the *gen.* And Ks allows *instigation* by all the *advs.* of place and *preps.* regularly; but others restrict it to hearsay, which is the proper way (R). IM says in the CK that there is a dispute about the *pron.* attached to these words, its position being that of (1) a *nom.* [as an *ag.* (Sn)], according to Fr; (2) an *acc.* [as an *obj.* (Sn)], according to Ks, [the *ag.* being latent, as ^{عَلَيْكَ} ^{زَيْدًا} meaning ^{الزَّم} ^{نَفْسَكَ} ^{زَيْدًا} *Keep thyself to Zaid* (Sn)]; (3) a *gen.* [by prothesis in such as ^{دُونِكَ}, and by the *p.* in such as ^{عَلَيْكَ} (Sn)], according to the BB, which is the correct opinion, because Akh quotes ^{عَلَى} ^{عَبْدِ} ^{اللَّهِ} ^{زَيْدًا} from chaste-speaking Arabs: [but in the first two opinions what is after the transfer to the *cat.* of verbal *n.* is regarded, and in the last what was before the transfer (Sn)]. And, in addition to that [ك in the position of a *gen.* (Sn)], with every one of these [verbal] *ns.* there is a latent *pron.* in the position of a *nom.* as an *ag.*, so that in corroboration you may say ^{عَلَيْكُمْ} ^{كُلُّكُمْ} ^{زَيْدًا} with the *gen.* as a *corrob.* of the present *gen.*, or the *nom.* as a *corrob.* of the latent *nom.*; [and similarly, when we say that the ك is in the position of an *acc.*, ^{عَلَيْكُمْ} ^{كُلُّكُمْ} is allowable;

whereas, when we say that it is in the position of a *nom.*, it is itself the *ag.* (Sn)].

§ 200. The ejaculatory *n.* is what is applied to (1) the address of the irrational, or of what is in the predicament of the irrational, such as the young of human beings; (2) the imitation of sounds: so [says IM] in the CK (A). The expressions that the GG name *ejs.* are of three kinds, (1) imitations of sounds proceeding from (a) dumb animals, like غاق [below]; (b) inanimate substances, alike طاق [below]: (2) sounds uttered from the mouths of human beings, and naturally indicative of meanings in their minds, like اف and تف; for he that is disgusted at anything utters from his breast a sound [Ugh!] resembling the expression اف, and from him that spits upon a disgusting thing proceeds a sound resembling تف: (3) cries wherewith animals are cried to when something is required from them, (a) coming, like جوت; (b) going, like هلا; (c) some other matter, like لا for drinking: but I see nothing to prevent our hazarding the conjecture that these cries, with which the brutes are cried to, are verbal *ns.* i. q. the *imp.*, as some hold; because God has made the brutes like rational beings in understanding what is required from them. The three kinds are named *ejs.* because they are *orig.* simple or disconnected sounds, not words indicative of meanings. Afterwards, being

wanted for use in the middle of the sentence, they are treated like words ; and co-ordinated with the noblest of words, i. e. *ns.*, the better to indicate their inclusion among the apparent kinds of words : so that the Tanwīn is affixed to some of them, as غَاقٍ and أَف [198]; اَلْ is prefixed to some [187], vid. when the *expression*, not the *meaning*, of the *ej.* is intended, as بِاسْمِ الْمَاءِ [123] and كَمَا زَعَمَتْ بِالْجَوْتِ [below]; some are made to mean i. q. *inf.* *ns.*, as أَف لَكَ , i. e. كَرَاهَةً لَكَ ; and some are governed in the *acc.* like *inf. ns.*, as وَاهَا لَكَ , i. e. طَيْبًا [198]: and what some GG say, vid. that the Tanwīn of غَاقٍ [below] denotes *indeterminateness* [198], is of no account, since *determinateness* and *indeterminateness* have no meaning [187] in it ; nor is there anything to prevent your saying the like of this about such as صَع and اِيء , because such as صَع is *orig.* an *ej.*; and then we shall be relieved from the difficulty of explaining the Tanwīn in the two preceding ways [187] (R). The ejaculatory *ns.* are [all (IA)] *uninfl.* (R, IA), because they are *orig.* simple sounds not entitled to construction, which is the requirer of inflection [159]; or because some of them are constituted like *ps.*, i. e. of 2 letters, as is said (R); [or] because they resemble the verbal *ns.* (IA). When they occur constructed, they may be *infl.* : Jahm Ibn Al'Abbas says

تَرَدُّ بِحَيْهَلٍ وَعَاجٍ وَ إِنَّمَا * مِنَ الْعَاجِ وَالْحَيْهَلِ جُنْ جُنْهَا

She is driven back with "Make haste" and "Get along"; and her madness is only inflamed from the "Get along" and the "Make haste"; and the poet [Dhu-rRumma (AAz)] says تَدَاعَيْنِ الْخَ [123]: but another [‘Uwaifi alKawāfi (FA) alFazāri (T)] says

دَعَاهُنَّ رَدَّنِي فَارْعَوْنِ لَصَوْتِهِ
كَمَا زَعَتِ بِالْجَوْتِ الظَّمَاءُ الصَّوَادِيَا

[He that rode behind me called them (certain women); and they forbore at his voice, (and returned to him,) as thou urgest with the جَوْتِ the thirsty parched (camels towards the water) (AAz)], by imitation notwithstanding the ا and ل; and you say زَجَرْتَهُ بِهِيْ or بِهِيْ I chid him with هِيْ [below], as you say in the case of ps. اِنْ لَوْا لَا يَحْدُ اِلَاةُ [191], and in the case of the uninfl. n. اِلَاةُ

بَايْنِ or تَعَالَى بَايْنِ God (exalted be He!) is not limited by "Where?": and with the ل inflection is more frequent than uninflectedness, as مِنَ الْعَاجِ وَالْحَيْهَلِ with the gen. and بِاسْمِ الشَّيْبِ, because the ل removes the n.

from resemblance to the p. [2]; but the ا and ل do not necessitate inflection, as is proved by اَلْآنَ [206] and

الَّذِي [176]: whereas, when the Tanwīn is affixed to these *ns.*, then, if their *expressions* be intended by them, as in *بِجَهْلٍ دُعَايَ*, they must be *infl.*, because it is then the Tanwīn of declinability; but, if it be affixed to them without this intention, as in *غَايَ* [above] and *ضَمَ*, they are *uninfl.*, because it is the Tanwīn of coordination and correspondence, not the Tanwīn of declinability. Among the *ejs.* that are imitations of the sounds of human beings, dumb animals, or inanimate substances, are (1) *طَلِيغٌ* the imitation of the sound of the laughter; (2) *غَايَ* or *غَايَ* the croak of the raven; (3) *شَيْبٌ* the imitation of the sound of the lips of camels in drinking; (4) *مَاءٌ* the cry of the doe-gazelle when she calls her young one; (5) *طَلَقَ* and *طَلَقَ* imitations of the sound of the fall of stones one upon another. Among the *ejs.* wherewith the brutes are cried to are (1) *هَلَا* for chiding horses, i.e. Step out, and sometimes used to chide the *she-ohmel* also; (2) *عَدَسٌ* for chiding the mule, and sometimes used as a name for a mule, both admissible in *عَدَسٌ أَلْعَ* [83], except that the pause upon the *سِ* strengthens the opinion that it is for chiding; (3) *هَيْدٌ* with four *dial. vars.*, and *هَادٌ* with Fath of the *د* for chiding camels; (4) *جَوَتْ* for calling

camels to drink ; (5) عَاجَ or عَاجَ for chiding the she-camel ; (6) سَا and تَشْوُ for calling the he-ass to water.

And among the *ejs. indicative of states in the mind of the speaker* are (1) دَى , which denotes *repentance* or *wonder* [187] : (a) according to Fr, the *o. f. of* دِل is دَى ; and the ل is a *prep.*, the *o. f.* being لَكَ دَى , i.e. عَجَبًا لَكَ *I wonder at thee !* ; but is afterwards so frequently used [with دَى] as to be compounded with it and become the ل of the *v.*, so that they say دِلًا and دِل : while others hold دِل , دِم , دِيس , and دِيب to be distinct words meaning *destruction*, and to be *inf. ns.* having no *vs.* [41] : (b) the saying دِلْمَة [84] is related with (a) Damm of the ل , in which case the *o. f.* is either (a) دِلْ أُمَة , *The destruction of his mother (is realized) !* , an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, i. e. هَلَاكُهَا , meaning *God destroy her !* , as قَاتَلَهُ اللَّهُ *God fight against him !* is said in *wonder*, because the thing, when it reaches its extreme, is cursed as a protection from the fatal eye ; while the Hamza is then irregularly elided [658] for alleviation, since دِلْمَة becomes like one word importing the meaning of عَجَبًا : or (β) دَى لَامَة *I marvel at*

his mother, (what a child she has borne) !, i.e. ^{عَجَبًا لَهَا أَي}
^{وَلَدٌ وَلَدَتْ}, the Damma of the Hamza being then irregularly
 transferred to the mobile ^ل, and the Hamza elided for
 alleviation, because the composition mentioned is intend-
 ed : (b) Kasr of the ^ل, in which case its *o. fr.* is ^{وَيَ لَا مَهْ},
 and the Hamza is then elided with its Damma : (c)
^{وَيَكُنْ}, as in ^{وَيَكُنْ - اللَّهُ}, XXVIII. 82. [below], is, ac-
 cording to Khl and S, ^{وَيَ} denoting *wonder* compounded
 with ^{كَانَ} [denoting *comparison* (B)], uncontracted, as
 in the text, or contracted [525], as in ^{وَيَكُنْ مِنْ آلِهِ}
 [187] ; but in this saying there is a sort of obscurity in
 the meaning, because the meaning of *comparison* is not
 plain in such as ^{وَيَكُنْ اللَّهُ يَبْسُطُ الرِّزْقَ}, XXVIII. 82.
 [above] *I marvel because, or verily* [187], *God enlarg-*
eth subsistence, ^{وَيَكُنْ آلِهِ}, XXVIII. 82. [509], and ^{وَيَكُنْ}
 [187] : while Fr says that ^{وَيَ} is a word of
wonder, which has the ^ك of allocution affixed to it, as in
^{عَجَبًا مِنْكَ} and ^{وَيْلَكَ} [187], i.e. ^{قِيلَ الْفَوَاسِيْ وَيَكُ الْآخِ}
I wonder at thee, and ^{أَنْ} added to it ; and that the mean-
 ing of XXVIII. 82. [509] is *Hast thou not seen that the*
unthankful etc ?, as though the person addressed were
 asserting that they did prosper, and the speaker there-

upon said to him *I marvel at thee*, and then, being asked "Wherefore marvellest thou at him?", went on to say *that* [meaning *because* (K)] *the unthankful prosper not*; so that the *prep.* [ل (K)] is suppressed with ^قأى and ^أأى, as is the rule [514]: and he mentions, as evidence of its meaning *Hast thou not seen?*, that, when an Arab woman of the desert asked her husband "Where is thy son?", he said ^أويك ^أأنة ^أوراء البيت meaning *Hast thou not seen that he is behind the tent?*; and that, since the meaning of ^قويك ^أأنة becomes *Hast thou not seen?*, the ك of allocution is not altered for the *fem.*, *du.*, or *pl.*, but keeps to one state: and this that Fr says is more probable as respects the meaning: (2) ^قأف and ^أأوة, both mentioned among the verbal *ns.* [187, 197]: (3) ^أبغ, a word said upon *admiration* and *pleasure* at the thing; and repeated for intensiveness, as ^أبغ ^أبغ: (a) if it be continuous, the غ may be single or double, being in either case pronounced with Kasr and Tanwīn, as says the poet, combining the two,

رَوَافِدُهُ أَكْرَمُ الرَّوَافِدَاتِ * بَغٍ لَكَ بَغٍ لِبَحْرِ خَضِرٍ

Its rafters are the most generous of rafters. Bravo to thee! Bravo to a munificent ocean of bounty!: (b) when explained by the ل, it is used as an *inf. n.*, as

before shown [187]: (4) ^{كَفَّ} and ^{أَخَّ}, [a word said upon *disgust* (AAz),] which, in the saying of the poet [Al'Ajjāj (AAz)]

لَا خَيْرَ فِي الشَّيْخِ إِذَا مَا جَحَّ * وَسَالَ غُرْبُ عَيْنِهِ وَلَحَّ
وَأَثْنَتِ الرَّجْلُ فَصَارَتْ فُصًّا * وَصَارَ وَصْلُ الْغَانِيَاتِ أَخًا

[*There is no good in the old man when he lets his water run, and the duct of his eye flows and fills with tears, and the leg bends and becomes curved like a snare, and the union of the blooming maids becomes loathsome* (AAz)], also related ^{كَفَّ}, is treated like the *inf. n.*, and is therefore *infl.*, being an *inf. n. i. q. the pass. part.*, i. e. ^{مَكْرُوهًا} (R).

§ 201. Some *adv.* [64] are *uninfl.* [159] (Sh, Jm), not all (Jm) : upon quiescence, like اِنْ [204] ; Fath, like اَلَا [206] ; Kasr, like اَمْسِ [206] ; and Damm, like حَيْثُ [202] (Sh). Among the [*uninfl.* (Jm)] *adv.* is that [*adv.* (Jm)] which is cut off from prothesis [by suppression of the *post.* in letter, not in intention (Jm)], like قَبْلُ and بَعْدُ (IH). The *adv.* heard cut off from prothesis [115], are قَدَامٌ , اِمَامٌ , فَوْقُ , تَحْتُ , بَعْدُ , قَبْلُ , مِّنْ عَلٍ , اَوَّلُ , دُونَ , اَسْفَلَ , خَلْفَ , وَرَاءَ ; and such as are in their sense, like اٰخِرُ , شِمَالُ , يَمِينُ , etc., are not treated analogously to them. The *post.* [*n.* or *prop.*] is suppressed, if the suppressed be represented *post.* to a *n.* in apposition with the 1st *pre.*, as اِلَّا عُلَّالَةٌ اَوْ [128] : whereas, if it be not represented, it is not suppressed, except from what is indicative of a *relative matter*, which is not complete without something else, like بَعْدُ , قَبْلُ , and their sisters mentioned, and كُلُّ , بَعْضُ , and اِنَّ ; nor even from this, except when there exists a context to specify that suppressed. These *adv.*, when cut off from the *post.*, are *uninfl.* because of

their resemblance to the *p.* [159] in their need [497] of the sense of that suppressed. As for ^{أَإِ}حَيْثُ, ^{أَإِ}أَإِ, and ^{أَإِ}أَإِ [159], although they are *pre.* to the *props.* present after them, still their prothesis is not apparent, since the prefixion is really to the *inf. ns.* of those *props.*, so that [they are *uninfl.* because] the *post.* is as it were suppressed; and, since the Tanwīn in ^{أَإِ}بَعْضٍ and ^{أَإِ}كُلِّ is substituted for the *post.* [128, 608], they are not *uninfl.*, because the *post.* is as it were expressed through the expression of its substitute. In these *adv.* uninflectedness is preferred to compensation, because *adv.* have little or no plasticity [64], and aplasticity is akin to uninflectedness, since the meaning of the latter is *inflectional aplasticity*; but Tanwīn as a compensation for the *post.* is also allowable, though rare, in these *adv.*, which are then *infl.*, as

وَنَحْنُ قَتَلْنَا الْأَزْدَ أَزْدَ شَنْوَةَ * فَمَا شَرَبُوا بَعْدًا عَلَى لَذَّةِ خَمْرٍ

And we slew the Azd, the Azd of Shanū'a; and after (that) they drank not wine with relish and

فَسَاغَ لِي الشَّرَابُ وَكُنْتُ قَبْلًا * أَكَادُ أَغْصُ بِالْمَاءِ الْفَرَاتِ

[by 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ya'rub, when he had taken his blood-revenge, Then wine became easy for me to swallow; and I was wont before (this) to be nearly choked with sweet water (Jsh)], whence the anomalous reading ^{أَإِ}مِنْ قَبْلِ

^أبدا ^بع ^أو^لا XXX. 3. [128] and the saying ^أبدا ^بع ^أو^لا
Begin with him, or it, at (the) first (of the time) : and,
 according to this, there is no difference in sense between
 the *infl.* and *uninfl.* forms of these *advs.* cut off [from
 prothesis, the sense of the suppressed *post.* being intend-
 ed to be understood with both], which is the truth ; but
 some say that they are then *infl.* only because of their
 not implying the sense of prothesis, so that ^أقبلا means
^أقبلا ^أقديما formerly, ^أاولا means ^أمتقدما previously, and ^أمن
^أقبل ^أمن ^أبعد means ^أمتقدما ^أومتأخرا previously and sub-
 sequently, [as though ^أقبلا ^أوبعدا were said, meaning
firstly and lastly (K, B),] because ^أمن is *red.* [499] (R).
 These *ns.* have four states, in one of which they are
uninfl., while in the rest they are *infl.* :—(1) they are
infl., (a) when they are *pre.* in letter, as ^أقبضت ^أدرهما ^ألا غيرة
I received a dirham, not another than it and
^أجئت ^أمن ^أقبل زيد *I came before Zaid* : (b) when the
post. is suppressed, but (a) its letter is intended to be
 understood, as ^أمن ^أقبل نادى النخ [128], the full phrase
 being ^أمن ^أقبل ذاك, in which state they remain like
 the *pre.* in letter, and are therefore not pronounced with
 Tanwīn ; (b) neither its letter nor its sense is intended
 to be understood, in which case they are *indet.*, whence

the reading ^{أَمِنْ} ^{بَعْدَ} ^{مِنْ} ^{قَبْلَ} XXX. 3. and the saying
 فَسَاغَ لِي الشَّرَابُ [above] (IA) : (2) they are *uninfl.*
 upon Damm when [they are cut off from prothesis in
 letter, but not in sense, so that (Sh)] the *post.* is sup-
 pressed [in letter (Sh)], but its sense is intended to be
 understood, as in XXX. 3. (IA, Sh) in the reading of
 the Seven with Damm, where IY [following Z in the M]
 supplies the ellipse as though the *o. f.* were ^{أَمِنْ} ^{قَبْلَ} ^{كُلِّ}
 شَيْءٍ ^{وَمِنْ} ^{بَعْدَهُ} [128], which sense is true, except that
^{أَمِنْ} ^{قَبْلَ} ^{الْغَلَبِ} ^{وَمِنْ} ^{بَعْدَهُ} before (the overcoming) and
 after (it) would be more appropriate to the context
 [502] (Sh), and in أَقْبَ مِنْ تَحْتَ النَّخْلِ [below] (IA) ;
 and similarly in the saying of the Ḥamāsī [Ma'n Ibn
 Aus (FA, Jsh) alMuzani (Jsh)]

لَعَمْرُكَ مَا أَدْرِي وَإِنِّي لَأَوْجِلُ * عَلَىٰ إِنِّمَا تَغْدُو الْمَنِيَّةُ أَوَّلَ

[By thy life, I know not—and verily I am much afraid—to
 which of us fate will go in the early morning at (the) first
 (of the time or hour) (FA, Jsh)], and the saying of the
 other ['Utayy Ibn Mālik al 'Uḵaili, cited by Fr (Akh),]

إِذَا أَنَا لَمْ أَدْرِكْ عَلَيْكَ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ * لِقَاؤُكَ إِلَّا مِنْ وَرَاءِ وَرَاءِ

(Sh) When I am not reassured about thee, nor is thy
 meeting save from behind, behind (a curtain) (Jsh).

Mb relates the verse

لَعْنُ الْإِلَهِ تَعَلَّى بَنِي مُسَافِرٍ * لَعْنًا يَشْنِي عَلَيْهِ مِنْ قَدَامٍ

[by a man of the Banu Tamīm, *God curse Ta'illa Ibn Musāfir with a curse that shall be poured upon him from before (Him) !* (FA)] with مِنْ قَدَامٍ, making it *indet.* ;

but Fr relates it with مِنْ قَدَامٍ, making it *det.* (Akh), *orig.* مِنْ قَدَامِهِ (FA). And F transmits أَبْدَا بَدَا مِنْ

أَبْدَا with Damm, by uninflectedness, because the *post.* is intended to be understood in sense ; with Fath, by inflection as a diptote [357], because the *post.* is not intended to be understood in letter or sense ; and with Kasr, because the *post.* is intended to be understood in letter (IA). And it is said that these *advs.* [that ought to be] pronounced with Damm may have Tanwīn with [the sign of] the *nom.* and *acc.*, as قَبْلًا and جُنْتُكَ قَبْلُ, like the *voc.* [that ought to be] pronounced with Damm, as يَا مَطَرًا and يَا مَطَرُ [48, 608] ; so that فَمَا شَرِبُوا بَعْدًا and وَكُنْتُ قَبْلًا may be instances of this (R). These *advs.*

[cut off from prothesis (R)] are named “finals” (R, Fk), because after the suppression [of the *post.* (YS)] they become finals in articulation after having been medials (Fk). But كُلُّ and بَعْضُ, [when cut off from prothesis (R),] are not named “finals”, because the compensation for the *post.* is expressed (R, YS). عَلٌ is a *n. i. q.*

فوق^{٩٨٧}, always used in two ways, (1) governed in the *gen.* by ^٩مِنْ and (2) apothetic [in letter (DM)]; so that ^{٩٨٨}مِنْ فَرْقَةٍ and ^{٩٨٩}مِنْ عُلُوَّةٍ is not said, as ^{٩٩٠}مِنْ عِلِّ السَّمَاءِ is said: but many are mistaken in this [2nd matter, saying that it may be *pre.* (DM)]; and among them are Jh and IM: and, as for the saying

يَا رَبِّ يَوْمٍ لِي لَا أَظِلُّ
أَرْضُ مِنْ تَحْتِ وَأَضْحَى مِنْ عَلَ

[by Abū Tharwān, *O many a day there is for me wherein I am not shaded, being scorched by the hot sand from beneath (my feet) and exposed to the sun from above (my head)! (Jsh)*], the ڤ is for silence, [not a *post. pron.* (DM),] as is proved by the fact that عَلْ is *uninfl.* [615]; whereas, if it were *pre.*, there would be no reason for its uninflectedness. When a *det.* [i.e. a *particular thing*, vid. a *specified superiority in position* (DM),] is meant by عَلْ, it is *uninfl.* upon Damm, by assimilation to the finals, [among which it is sometimes included (DM),] as in this verse, since what is meant is *superiority in position to [the poet] himself*, not *unrestricted superiority in position*, the sense being that *the burning sand affects him from beneath him, and the heat of the sun from above him*; and similarly in the saying of the other [Abū-n-Najm al-Ijlī (Jsh)] describing a horse

أَقْبَبَ مِنْ تَحْتِ عَرِيضٍ مِنْ عِلٍّ * مُعَارِدٌ كَرَّةٌ أَدْبَرُ أَقْبَلِ

[(He is) lean below (his belly), broad above (his back), returning again and again to the charge of "Retreat, advance", though the citation of this verse by IHsh is not free from doubt, because the final of every hemistich in every one of these verses is a ج pronounced with Kasr, and perhaps he was not acquainted with the ode (Jsh)] : and, when an *indet.* is meant by عِلٌّ, it is *infl.*, as in the saying [of Imra alKais (EM)]

مَكْرٌ مَفْرٌ مَقْبِلٌ مَدْبِرٌ مَعَا
كَجَلْمَوْدٍ صَخْرٍ حَطَا السَّيْلُ مِنْ عِلٍّ

[Good at charging, good at fleeing, advancing and retreating together, like a mass of rock that the torrent has brought down from above (EM)], since what is meant is to compare the horse [81] in his swiftness to a mass of rock that has come down from some high place or other, not from any particular height (ML). It has several dial. vars. (IY) : you say (1) جَنَّتَهُ مِنْ عِلٍّ, [*infl.* (R), defective (IY), like عِم (IY, R) and شِمٌّ, as كَجَلْمَوْدٍ صَخْرٍ (IY, R) and قَاضٍ (IY, R) and (2) مِنْ عَالٍ, [like قَاضٍ (IY, R) and غَازٍ, as

قَبَا مِنْ تَحْتِ وَرِيَا مِنْ عَالٍ

Lean below, and plump above (IY)]; (3) ^أمِنْ ^عمَعَالٍ ,
[like ^أمِرَامٍ (R), as says Dhu-rRumma

وَنَغْضَانِ الرَّحْلِ مِنْ ^عمَعَالٍ

And the swaying of the camel-saddle above (IY)]; (4)
^أرَحَى , [abbreviated (IY), like ^عصَا (IY, R) and ^أمِنْ ^ععَلَا ,
as ^أمِنْ ^ععَلَوٍ (M, R), as (5-7) (IY)] (507) ^أفَهِىَ ^أتَنُوشِى ^أالْخِ
says A'shà Bāhila [lamenting AlMuntashir Ibn Wahb
alBāhili, one of the great runners of the Arabs (Mb),]
^أإِنِّى ^أأَتَتْنِى ^ألِسَانٌ ^ألَا ^أأَسْرِبُهَا * مِنْ ^أعَلٍ ^ألَا ^أأَعْجَبُ مِنْهَا ^أوَلَا ^أأَسْخَرُ
Verily a message has come to me from up-country,
whereby I shall not be gladdened. There is neither
wondering at it, nor scoffing, related with Damm, Fath,
and Kasr (IY, R) of its ر (R); (8) مِنْ ^أعَلٍ , as

وَلَقَدْ سَدَدْتُ عَلَيْكَ كُلَّ ثَنِيَّةٍ * وَأَتَيْتُ فَوْقَ بَنِي كَلَيْبٍ مِنْ ^أعَلٍ

[by AlFarazdaq satirizing Jarīr, *And assuredly I did*
stop against thee every mountain-road, and come down
upon the Banū Kulaib from above (them) (FA, Jsh)]:
and these *dial. vars.* have one meaning, vid. ^أفَوْقَ (IY).

When you make ^ععَلٍ *uninfl.* upon Damm, the ^لل, i. e.
the ^يي, must be elided, and clean forgotten, since, if you
said ^ععَلِى, the Damma upon the ^يي would be deemed

heavy; and, if you elided the Damma, and said ^{عَلَى}, its being *uninfl.* upon Damm would not be plain: and, when you intend to make ^{عَلَوْ} *uninfl.*, its ف must be pronounced with Fath; whereas with inflection it may be pronounced with Damm or Kasr, as ^{عَلَوْ الدَّارَ} *At the top of the house*, like ^{سَفْلَهَا} *At its bottom*. As for ^{عَلَوْ}, it may be *uninfl.* upon Fath, contrary to the rest of the finals, because of the heaviness of the و pronounced with Damm: and the Kasr, as ^{مِنْ عَلَوْ}, is either because [it is *infl.*, and] the *post.* is supplied, as in ^{لَيْسَ غَيْرَ} with Fath [below], in which case this Kasr is found only with a *prep.* before it or with prefixion to the ^{سِ} of the *pron.* [129]; or because it is *uninfl.* upon Kasr on account of the Damma's being deemed heavy: while the Damm, as ^{مِنْ عَلَوْ}, is according to the analogy of the rest of the finals. The finals are *uninfl.* upon a vowel in order that they may be known to be radically *infl.* [159]: and upon Damm in order that they may be reinvigorated with the strongest of the vowels because of the weakness that overtakes them through the suppression of the needed *post.*; or in order that all the vowels may be completed for them, because in the state of inflection, being mostly aplastic, they are governed either in the *gen.* by ^{مِنْ} or in the *acc.* as *adv.* [64]; or in order that

their uninflectional may be different from their inflectional vowel (R). And ^{أَ}لَيْسَ ^{أَ}غَيْرَ or ^{أَ}لَا ^{أَ}غَيْرَ and ^{أَ}حَسْبُ are treated in the same way (IH) as the *adv.* cut off from prothesis (Jm). ^{أَ}غَيْرَ [90] is a *n.* inseparable from prothesis (ML, A) in sense [115] ; but may be cut off from it in letter, if the sense of the *post.* be understood, and ^{أَ}غَيْرَ be preceded by the word ^{أَ}لَيْسَ [96], the saying ^{أَ}لَا ^{أَ}غَيْرَ [below] being a solecism. [There are six constructions with it (DM):] one says (1-2) قَبَضْتُ عَشْرَةً ^{أَ}لَيْسَ ^{أَ}غَيْرَهَا I have received ten, not another than they is (received), or it, i. e. the received, is not another than they, with ^{أَ}غَيْرَ in (a) the *nom.*, by suppression of the *pred.*, i. e. مَقْبُوضًا ; (b) the *acc.*, by subaudition [i. e. latency (DM)] of the *sub.* [in ^{أَ}لَيْسَ (DM)], i. e. لَيْسَ الْمَقْبُوضُ ^{أَ}غَيْرَهَا (3) : لَيْسَ ^{أَ}لَيْسَ ^{أَ}غَيْرَ [above] it, i. e. the received, is not another (than they), also by subaudition of the *sub.*, and by suppression of the *post.* in letter, but expression of it in intention, [in which case ^{أَ}غَيْرَ is *infl.* (DM),] like the reading [of {‘Āsim (MAd)} alJahdarī and {‘Aun (IY)} al‘Ukailī (IY, Sh)] مِنْ قَبْلِ الْغَلْبِ XXX. 3., i. e. مِنْ قَبْلِ دَمْنٍ بَعْدَ ^{أَ}لَيْسَ ^{أَ}غَيْرَ [above] : (4) ^{أَ}لَيْسَ ^{أَ}غَيْرَ not another (than they) is (received), or it, i. e. the received, is not another (than they), in which case (a) Mb and the moderns say that

the Damma is a Damma of uninflectedness, [because the *post.* is suppressed, and its sense, not its letter, is intended to be understood (DM),] not of inflection, and that ^{٥٨٧}غَيْر is assimilated to the finals, like ^{٥٨٧}قَبْل and ^{٥٨٧}بَعْد ; and, according to this, it may be [in the place of a *nom.* as (DM)] *sub.*, or [of an *acc.* as (DM)] *pred.* [of ^{٥٨٧}لَيْسَ (DM)]: (b) Akh says that it is a Damma of inflection, [the absence of Tanwin being because the letter of the *post.* is intended to be understood (DM),] not of uninflectedness, because ^{٥٨٧}غَيْر is not a *n.* of *time*, like ^{٥٨٧}قَبْل and ^{٥٨٧}بَعْد , nor of *place*, like ^{٥٨٧}فَوْق and ^{٥٨٧}تَحْتَ , but is only like ^{٥٨٧}كُل and ^{٥٨٧}بَعْض ; and, according to this, it is [in the *nom.* as (DM)] the *sub.*, the *pred.* being suppressed: (c) IKh says that it admits of both alternatives, [uninflectedness and inflection (DM)]: (5) ^{٥٨٧}لَيْسَ غَيْرًا *it, i. e. the received, is not another* and (6) ^{٥٨٧}لَيْسَ غَيْر *not another is (received)*, in both of which the vowel is inflectional, because the Tanwin denotes either *complete declension* [608], in which case it is affixed only to *infl. ns.*; or *compensation*, in which case the *post.* is as it were mentioned (ML): here nothing at all [belonging to the *post.*] is intended to be understood ; but with the *acc.* the *sub.* is understood ^{٥٨٧}لَيْسَ , and with the *nom.* the *pred.* is suppressed (DM). As for the saying ^{٥٨٧}لَا غَيْر [above], which occurs in the phrases of the learned, it

was not spoken by the Arabs ; so that the learned say **لَا** either by analogy to **لَيْسَ**, or by inadvertence (Sh). Apparently, however, there is no difference between the **غَيْرُ** negatived by **لَيْسَ** and the one negatived by **لَا**, as is shown in the M by Z, and in the Kāfiya by IH, who is followed in that by his commentators, and, among them, the critical judges, [like R (DM)]; and **غَيْرُ** has been heard to occur after **لَا**, for IM cites in the CT

جَوَابًا بِهِ تَنْجُوْا اَعْتَمِدْ فَوْرِ بِنَا • لَعْنُ عَمَلٍ اَسْلَفَتْ لَا غَيْرَ تَسَالِ

*Rely thou upon an answer whereby thou shalt escape ; for, by our Lord, thou wilt be asked about a deed that thou hast done before, not another : so that what occurs in the ML and Sh is not to be regarded (Fk). ^{٥٨}غَيْر is assimilated to the final *adv.* because of the extreme vagueness in it [114], as in the finals, on account of their being unconfined relative locations [64] : but the *post.* is not suppressed from it except with the ^{٧٤}لَا of exemption and ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ, as ^{٥٨}أَعْلَ هَذَا لَا ^{٥٨}غَيْر ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ I will do this, nothing else and ^{٥٨}جَاؤَنِي ^{٥٨}زَيْدٌ ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ ^{٥٨}غَيْرٌ Zaid came to me, no one else, from the frequent use of ^{٥٨}غَيْر after ^{٧٤}لَا and ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ ; and ^{٥٨}غَيْر after ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ is i. q. ^{٩٠}أَلَا [90], the *post.* suppressed in ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ ^{٥٨}جَاؤَنِي ^{٥٨}زَيْدٌ ^{٥٨}لَيْسَ ^{٥٨}غَيْرٌ being the excepted suppressed in ^{٩٠}أَلَا*

Zaid has come to me: he, etc. [96](R). ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَسْبُ is i. q. [the pre. n. in] ^{٩ ٨ ٧}كَافِيكَ, an act. part. [24, 68] whereby the present is meant, so that [from regard to its being i. q. ^{٩ ٨ ٧}كَافِ (Sn)] it is used as an *indet. ep.*, being an *ep.* of an *indet.*, as ^{٩ ٨ ٧}مَرَّتْ بِرَجُلٍ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَسْبِكَ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}مِنْ رَجُلٍ [143]; and a *d. s.* to a *det.*, as ^{٩ ٨ ٧}هَذَا عَبْدُ اللَّهِ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَسْبِكَ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}مِنْ رَجُلٍ This is 'Abd Allāh, sufficing thee as a man. And [from regard to its *prim.* expression (Sn)] it is also used as a *prim. substantive*, [occurring as an *inch.* or *enunc.*, at present or before the prefixion of the annuller (Sn),] as ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَسْبُهُمْ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}جَهَنَّمُ LVIII. 9. [Their sufficiency is Hell, or Hell is their sufficiency (Sn)], ^{٩ ٨ ٧}فَإِنَّ حَسْبَكَ اللَّهُ VIII. 64. Verily thy sufficiency is God, [like the saying of Jarīr

^{٩ ٨ ٧}إِنِّي وَجَدْتُ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}مِنْ أَمْرِكُمْ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَسْبَكُمْ * ^{٩ ٨ ٧}أَنْ تَلْبَسُوا ^{٩ ٨ ٧}حَرَ الثِّيَابِ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}وَتَشْبَعُوا (K, P) Verily I have found your sufficiency of noble deeds to be this, that you should wear the best of clothes, and be full of meat (N),] and ^{٩ ٨ ٧}بِحَسْبِكَ ^{٩ ٨ ٧}دِرْهَمٌ [Thy sufficiency is a dirham (Sn)]. And this is an objection to its being a verbal *n.* [68], since the *lit. ops.* are not prefixed to verbal *ns.* [by common consent; and similarly the *id. ops.*, like inchoation, according to the correctest doctrine (Sn)]. It is also cut off from prothesis, in which case

it undergoes two innovations, being (1) imbued with a sense indicative of *negation* ; and (2) always used (a) as an *ep.*, *d. s.*, or *inch.*, and (b) *uninfl.* upon Damm : you say [in the case of the *ep.*, or *d. s.*] رَأَيْتُ رَجُلًا حَسْبُ or رَأَيْتُ زَيْدًا حَسْبُ I saw a man, or Zaid, sufficing (me or thee), as though, says Jh, you said حَسْبُكَ or حَسْبِي ;

and in the case of the *inch.* قَبِضْتُ عَشْرَةَ فَحَسْبُ I received ten ; and (my) sufficiency (was that), i. e. فَحَسْبِي (A). What is *post.* to حَسْبُ may be [thus] suppressed from frequency of usage ; and it is *uninfl.* upon Damm by assimilation to غَيْرُ , since, like the latter [114], it does not become *det.* by prothesis. The *adv.* *pre.* to *props.* are of two kinds, (1) necessarily *pre.* to them by application [115], which are three in number, حَيْثُ in place, and اِذَا and اِذَا in time : (a) there is a dispute [204] as to whether the [cond.] *prop.* immediately following اِذَا governs اِذَا or not ; and, if it does, اِذَا is not *pre.* to it ; but, if it does not, اِذَا is *pre.* to it : (b) حَيْثُ and اِذَا are *pre.* to the verbal and nominal [*props.*] ; but there is a dispute [204] as to whether اِذَا may be *pre.* to the nominal : (2) allowably *pre.* to the *prop.*, which are only *ns.* of time *pre.* to a *prop.* from which one of

the three *times* is imported : (a) that is stipulated for the sake of the affinity between the *pre.* and *post.* in indicating *unrestricted time*, even if the two *times* be different, this affinity being needed because prefixion to the *prop.* is not in accordance with the *o. f.*, since the *post.* in reality is the *inf. n.* implied by the *prop.*, not the *prop.* itself; and, according to this, a *n.* of *place* is ordinarily not *pre.* to a *prop.* [124], because one of the *places* is not specifically imported from the *prop.*, as one of the *times* is. The general rule is that the *n.* of *time* should be *pre.* to the verbal [*prop.*], because the *v.* indicates *one of the times* by application [402] ; and therefore the *n.* of *time* is *pre.* to the verbal more often than to the nominal [*prop.*] : but *time* is imported from the nominal *post.* [*prop.*] by the circumstance that the 2nd of its two terms is a *v.*, as in ^{يَوْمَ هُمْ عَلَى النَّارِ يُقْتَنُونَ} LI. 13. [(*It will occur on, or is,*) *the day when they shall be burnt upon the fire* (K, B)] ; or that, if its two terms be *ns.*, its purport is notorious for occurring in one of the three *times*, either the *past*, as ^{أَتَيْتَكَ حِينَ الْحَجَّاجِ أَمِيرِ} *I came to thee when AlHajjāj was governor*, or the *future*, as XL. 16. [1] ; while the saying of Mb in the Kāmil that the allowably *pre. n.* of *time* is not *pre.* to a nominal [*prop.*] except upon condition of the *prop.*'s being *past* in sense, by assimilation to the necessarily *pre.* ^{أَنَّ}, is falsified by LI. 13. [above], XL. 16. [1,124], and ^{the} like. All of

this is when the *n.* of *time* is *pre.* to a *prop.* of whose *inf. n.* it is the *adv.* in sense, as you see : whereas, if the *n.* of *time* be not an *adv.* to the *inf. n.*, but be either *before* or *after* the latter, it has not with the *prop.* that peculiarity which the *adv.* of the *inf. n.* of the *prop.* has ; and therefore it is not used except with an infinitival *p.*, like ^{أَن} , ^{أَنْ} , and ^{مَا} , before the *prop.*, as ^{مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ} , ^{نَطْمِسَ وَجْهَهَا} IV. 50. *Before that We deform faces* and IX. 118. [460]. As for ^{رَيْثٌ} , [which is not a *n.* of *time*,] it is *pre.* to the verbal *prop.* [124], as ^{تَوَقَّفْ رَيْثٌ} , ^{أَخْرَجَ إِلَيْكَ} *Wait until I come out to thee*, because it is an *inf. n.* meaning *delay*, made to act as a substitute for the *pre. n.* of *time* [65], the *o. f.* being ^{زَمَانٌ رَيْثٌ} , ^{خُرُوجِي} *during the time of the delay of my coming out*, i. e. *during the period that my coming out delays, until it enters into existence*, meaning *until I come out* ; and similarly ^{أَيَّةٌ} i. q. ^{عَلَامَةٌ} may be *pre.* to the verbal *prop.* because of its resemblance to ^{وَقْتُ} , since *times* are *signs* whereby events are timed and acts specified : but, since the sense of *time* is adventitious in ^{رَيْثٌ} and ^{أَيَّةٌ} , they are mostly *pre.* to the verbal *prop.* headed by an infinitival *p.*, as the poet says ^{بَايَةً يَأْتِيهَا} and ^{بَايَةً مَا تُحِبُّونَ} , [124, 571], and you say ^{أَقِمْ رَيْثًا} ^{أَخْرَجَ} *Bide until I come*

out ; and, since, according to the KK [below], the *n.* of time itself is *pre.* to the verbal [*prop*] with an infinitival *p.*, how much more is what resembles it ! And ذُو also, when *infl.* as in ذُو مَالٍ [16], is *pre.* to the verbal [*prop.*] in their sayings اِذْهَبْ بِذِي تَسْلَمٍ [124], اِذْهَبْ بِذِي تَسْلَمَانِ, and اِذْهَبُوا بِذِي تَسْلَمُونَ : some say that this [prefixion] is anomalous, [because ذُو is not a *n.* of time,] ذِي being *ep.* of الامرِ, i. e. مَعَ الامرِ ذِي السَّلَامَةِ with the (matter) possessed of safety, meaning مَعَ الامرِ الَّذِي تَسْلَمُ فِيهِ with the matter wherein thou shalt be safe, the ب being i. q. مَعَ ; but Sf says that the *n.* qualified by ذِي [142] is في الوقتِ, i. e. في الوقتِ ذِي السَّلَامَةِ in the (time) possessed of safety, meaning في وقتٍ تَسْلَمُ فِيهِ in a time wherein thou shalt be safe, the ب being i. q. فِي, in which case the prefixion is not anomalous, because ذُو is like a *n.* of time *pre.* to the *v.* ; while some say that it is the Tā' ذُو *infl.*, which is improbable, because the Tā' ذُو in the best known *dial.* has the و in all cases [176]. And sometimes ذُو in prefixion to the *v.* is used in the same way as in prefixion to the *n.*, as جَاءَنِي ذُو فَعَلٍ He that did come to me and ذُرُوا فَعَلًا and ذُرُوا فَعَلًا and

ذَوَاتُ فَعَلْنَ and ذَوَاتَا فَعَلَتَا and ذَاتُ فَعَلَتْ, being then either Tā'ī, according to the *dial.* transmitted by IDn [176] ; or i. q. مَاجِبْ anomalously *pre.* to the *v.* S says that, when one of the two terms of the *prop.* immediately following حَيْثُ and إِذَا is a *v.*, it is better to put that *v.* first, because these two *adv.* contain the sense of *condition*, which is more appropriate to the *v.*, so that حَيْثُ زَيْدٌ يَجْلِسُ is better than زَيْدٌ يَجْلِسُ : but what he says here about إِذَا requires consideration, from the frequency of such [phrases] as I. XXXIV. 1. [23, 204] and LXXXII. 1. إِذَا السَّمَاءُ انْفَطَرَتْ وَإِذَا الْكَوَاكِبُ انْتَفَرَتْ 2. *When the heaven shall be cloven in sunder, and when the stars shall be scattered.* مِثْلٌ and غَيْرٌ are sometimes assimilated to the *adv.* necessarily *pre.* to *props.*, i. e. حَيْثُ, إِذْ, and إِذَا, because they are vague, like those *adv.* : but, since they are only remotely assimilated to those *adv.*, they are not *pre.* to the pure *prop.* in the same way as those *adv.* are, but to a *prop.* headed by an infinitival *p.*, as LI. 23. [518], لَمْ يَمْنَعْ الشَّرْبَ الْخَ [90], and غَيْرَ أَنِّي قَدْ الْخَ [90] ; because the affinity between the *pre. n.* of *time* and the *post. prop.* in their indicating *time*, and the fact that the *n.* of *time* is an *adv.* to the *inf. n.* of the *post. prop.*, enable the infinitival *p.* to be

dispensed with in the case of the *n.* of *time*, but are not found in ^٩مِثْل and ^٩غَيْر, so that the infinitival *p.* is needed in their case. The KK [above], however, transmit from the Arabs that the *adv.* also are *pre.* to ^{٢٤}أَنْ and ^{٨٤}أَنَّ, as ^٩يَوْم ^{٨٤}أَنْ يَقُومَ زَيْدٌ and ^٩يَوْم ^{٨٤}أَنْكَ مُحْسِنٌ; and, if this were right, those *adv.* might be *infl.* and *uninfl.*, like ^٩مِثْل and ^{٨٤}غَيْر in ^{٨٤}مِثْلَ مَا أَنْتُمْ LI. 23. [518,159] and ^{٨٤}غَيْرَ أَنْ نَطَلَقَتْ [90, 159]. The author of the Mughni says that, the *adv.* *pre.* to *props.* being *det.*, it is correct to say ^٩حَتَّى يَوْمٌ or ^٩قَدِمَ زَيْدٌ الْحَارَ : but, besides the strangeness of this usage and the fact that it has not been heard, the *pre.* ought not to be *det.* when the *ag.* in the verbal or *inch.* in the nominal [*prop.*] is *indet.*, as ^٩يَوْمٌ قَدِمَ أَمِيرٌ and ^٩يَوْمٌ قَدِمَ أَمِيرٌ كَرِيمٌ, since the sense is ^٩يَوْمٌ قَدِمَ أَمِيرٌ [111]. The *n.* of *time* or ^٩حَيْث, even if it be not an *adv.*, is *pre.* to the *prop.* [124], as LXXVII. 35. [159], V. 119. [1], VI. 124. [64], and

يَا ذُلَّ حَيْثُ يَكُونُ مَنْ يَتَذَلُّ

O the lowliness of the place where he that is lowly is!, [where ^٩ذُلَّ is *pre.* to ^٩حَيْثُ (J)]. As for such as ^٩يَوْمَئِذٍ [204], ^٩حِينَئِذٍ, and ^٩سَاعَتِئِذٍ, the *adv.* are said to be

pre. to أَذْ *pre.* in sense to a suppressed *prop.* that the Tanwīn is substituted for [128, 608]: but that [explanation] involves obscurity as respects the sense, since حِينَ وَقْتَ كَذَا and يَوْمَ الْوَقْتِ and the like are strange in usage, corrupt in sense, contrary to such as بَعْدَ إِذْ أَنْتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ III. 74. *After ye have been Muslims*, since its sense is *after that time*, while in أَلَيَّ يَوْمَ الْوَقْتِ الْمَعْلُومِ XV. 38. *Until the day of the known promise* الْوَقْتُ, says F, is i. q. الْوَعْدُ; and it seems to me that these *advs.*, which are as it were apparently *pre.* to أَذْ, are [really] *pre.* not to it, but to the suppressed *props.*, [like the *adv.* in إِذْ,] except that, when these *props.* are suppressed because indicated by the drift of the sentence, it is not good that a Tanwīn should be substituted for them affixed to these *advs.*, as it is substituted in كُلٌّ, بَعْضٌ, and أَذْ [128]. For, كُلٌّ and its sisters being inseparable from prothesis in sense [115], the suppression of the *post.* is inferred from the sense; and, that suppressed being specified by the circumstantial evidence obtained from the drift of the sentence, what is meant becomes complete, as in XXI. 79. [128], XLIII. 31. [128], and نَهَيْتَكَ عَنْ الْخِ [204]: whereas, these *advs.* not being inseparable from prothesis in sense, if you said جَاءَنِي زَيْدٌ وَكُنْتُ حِينَئِذَا كَذَا, intending

to suppress the *post.* and substitute the Tanwīn of حِينًا for it, i. e. حِينَ ذَٰلِكَ at the time (of that), حِينًا would not appear to be used in that sense, but the Tanwīn in it would appear to denote [*declinability* and] *indeterminateness*; [for I see nothing to prevent one Tanwīn from denoting *declinability* and *indeterminateness* together, since many a *p.* imports two meanings, so that the Tanwīn in وَجَلْ imports *indeterminateness* also, but, when you use the *n.* as a name, denotes *pure declinability* (R on the Tanwīn)]. Since, then, they fear that the Tanwīn of *compensation* in يَوْمًا, حِينًا, and سَاعَةً should be confounded with the Tanwīn of *declinability* and *indeterminateness*, they effect the indication of the suppressed *props. orig. post.* to those *advs.* by putting as a total *subst.* for those *advs.* an *adv.* [أَنَّ] inseparable from prefixion to *props.*, light in expression, applicable to all sorts of *ns.* of time, سَاعَةً, حِينًا, يَوْمًا, لَيْلَةً, etc, and accustomed to suppression of the *props. post.* to it, together with substitution of Tanwīn for them, as in وَأَنْتَ إِنْ صَحِیحٌ [204]. Thus أَنَّ is put after those *advs.* as a [total] *subst.* for them, together with the Tanwīn of *compensation*, in order that the Tanwīn may be as it were existent in the *ant. advs.*, because the total *subst.* [150], being not only ideally put into the place of the *ant.* [151], but unre-

strictedly applicable to what the *ant.* is applicable to, is as it were the *ant.*; and اِذَا is pronounced with Kasr of the ذ because of the concurrence of the two quiescents [608], this vowel [664] being necessary in order that اِذَا may be like a *decl. n.* governed in the *gen., post.* to the 1st *adv.*, so that the suppression of the *post.* from the 1st *adv.* without uninflectedness upon Damm or the Tanwin of *compensation* may not be disapproved; and, since the object mentioned is effected by means of اِذَا, and the *adv.* mentioned are *future* and *past*, اِذَا is divested of the sense of the *past*, and becomes denotative of *unrestricted adverbiality*, so that it may be used in the *future* [204] also, as فَوَيْلٌ يَوْمَئِذٍ لِلْمُكَذِّبِينَ LII. 11. *Then woe on that day to them that treat the signs of God as false and the like.* But the truth is that اِذَا, when the *post.* is suppressed, and the Tanwin substituted for it, otherwise than in such as يَوْمَئِذٍ, may be pronounced with Fath also, whence فَعَلْتُهَا اِذَا وَاَنَا مِنَ الضَّالِّينَ XXVI. 19. *I did it then, when I was one of the erring, i. e. I did it when thou hadst brought me up, since requital* [594] has no meaning here. The *adv. pre.* to the *prop.* being an *adv.* to the *inf. n.* implied by the *prop.*, as we stated before, a *pron.* may not relate to it from the *prop.* [124], so that اَتَيْتَكَ يَوْمَ قَدِمَ زَيْدٌ فَيْدٍ is not said, because, the

lightness (Jm)]: and similarly ^{هـ}مِثْل and ^{هـ}غَيْر, [i. e. ^{هـ}مِثْل (R)] with ^{هـ}مَ, and [^{هـ}غَيْر with (R)] ^{هـ}أَنْ or ^{هـ}أَنَّ (IH), may be *uninfl.* [90, 111, 159] (R, Jm), by common consent (R), upon Fath (Jm).

§ 202. ^{هـ}حَيْث or [in the *dial.* of Ṭayyi (ML)] ^{هـ}حَوْث, is [*uninfl.* (R, DM),] pronounced in both *dials.* with (1) Damm of the ^{هـ}ث [according to the best known usage (R)], by assimilation to the finals [201], because [its (R)] prefixion [to the *prop.* (ML)] is like no prefixion, [since its effect, vid. the sign of the *gen.* {in the *post.* (DM)}, is not apparent (ML)]; (2) Kasr, [according to the *o. f.* in the concurrence of two quiescents (ML)]; (3) Fath [for alleviation (ML)]: and ^{هـ}حَيْث is *infl.* (R, ML) by some of the Arabs (ML), which is a Fak'asī *dial.* (R, DM); while the reading ^{هـ}مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ VII. 181. [So that they shall not know (what We mean to do with them) (B)] may be an instance of this [*infl.* (DM) *dial. var.* or of the *dial. var. uninfl.* upon Kasr. It denotes *place*, by common consent (ML): and Akh says that it sometimes denotes *time* (T, R, ML), as

لَلْفَتَى عَقْلٌ يَعِيشُ بِهِ * حَيْثُ تَهْدِي سَاقَهُ قَدَمُهُ

[by Ṭarafa (Ahl),] *The youth has understanding where-
by he lives while his foot guides his shank* (T, R, DM),
because the sense is *during the period of his toil and his*

life (T); but here also it may denote *place* (R, DM). It is mostly [in the place of an *acc.* as (ML)] an *adv.* (R, ML), as ^{فَاَقْتُلُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ حَيْثُ وَجَدْتُمُوهُمْ} IX. 5. *Slay ye the unbelievers wherever ye find them* (DM); or of a *gen.* governed by ^{مِنْ} (ML), as ^{وَمِنْ حَيْثُ خَرَجْتَ}, as ^{فَوَلِّ وَجْهَكَ شَطْرَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ} II. 144. (DM) *And from whatever place thou comest forth (to journey), turn thy face in the direction of the sacred mosque (when thou prayest)* (B): but not always (R), being sometimes governed in the [place of a (DM)] *gen.* by something else (ML) than ^{مِنْ} (DM), as

فَشَدَّ وَلَمْ يَقْزَعْ بِيُودًا كَثِيرَةً
لَدَى حَيْثُ أَقَامَتْ رَحْلَهَا أَمْ قَشَعَمَ

[by Zuhair, *Then he attacked (him); and scared not (the people of) many tents, at the place where Fāte (8) had thrown down her camel-saddle, i. e. at her abode* (EM)]; and [sometimes a direct *obj.*, agreeably with the opinion of F, who attributes to it (ML)] VI. 124. [64, 201] (R, ML), since the sense is that *God knoweth [360] the place itself that is meet for the bestowal of the Apostolate therein, not something in the place* (ML), and similarly

أَمَا تَرَى حَيْثُ سَهِيلُ الْغُ
هِيَ أَحْسَنُ النَّاسِ حَيْثُ نَظَرُ [below], where it is the [direct (AAz)] *obj.* of تَرَى; while ^{هِيَ أَحْسَنُ النَّاسِ حَيْثُ نَظَرُ}

^{نَاطِرٌ} *She is the most beautiful of mankind in a place where a looker looks* has been transmitted, meaning ^{جَهَا} *in face*, where it is a *sp.* (R). It does not occur as *sub.* of ^{أَنْ} *ان*, contrary to the opinion of IM; nor has he any evidence in the saying

^{أَنْ} *أَنْ حَيْثُ اسْتَقَرَّ مِنْ أَنْتَ رَاعِيٌّ حَيْثُ فَيْدٍ عِزَّةٌ وَأَمَانٌ*
 [Verily the place, where he that thou art the protector of resides, is a sanctuary wherein are honor and safety (DM)], because ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* may be construed to be a *pred.*, and ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* a *sub.*, [i. e. *Verily a sanctuary etc. is (in the place) where etc.* (DM)]. ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* is always *pre.* to the *prop.*, nominal or verbal; but more often to the verbal, for which reason the *acc.* is preferable in such as ^{جَلَسْتُ} *جلست* ^{أَرَأَيْتَ} *أرأيت* ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* *I sat where (I see) Zaid, I see him* [62] (ML). Its prefixion to the single term is extraordinary, as

^{نَضَاعَتُهُمْ} *نضاعتهم* ^{تَحْتَ} *تحت* ^{الْكَلْبِ} *الكلبي* ^{بَعْدَ} *بعد* ^{ضَرْبِهِمْ} *ضربهم*
^{بِيَضِ} *بيضي* ^{الْمَوَاضِي} *المواضي* ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* ^{لِي} *لي* ^{الْعَمَائِمِ} *العمائم*

(R, ML), said to be by AlFarazdak, *And we pierce them below the kidneys after smiting them with the sharp swords at the place of the fold of the turbans, where* ^{حَيْثُ} *حيث* is in the position of an *acc.* as an *adv.* (SM), and

أَمَّا تَرَى حَيْثُ سَهِيلٌ طَالِعًا
نَجْمًا يَضِيءُ كَالْأَشْهَابِ لَامِعًا

[above] (R) *Seest thou not the place of Canopus when rising? (I mean by Canopus) a star that shines like the flame, gleaming* (J): but Ks holds it to be regular; and thus can be explained the saying of the Lawyers ^{مِنْ} حَيْثُ ^{أَنَّ} كَذَا Whereas such and such, [with Fath of the Hamza of ^{أَنَّ} (518) (DM)]. And more extraordinary than that is its prefixion to a suppressed *prop.*, as

إِذَا رِيْدَةٌ مِنْ حَيْثُ مَا نَفَحَتْ لَهُ * أَتَاةٌ بِرِيَاها خَلِيلُ يُوَاصِلُهُ
[by Abū Hayya anNumairi, *When a breeze from wherever (it blows) is wafted to him (the he-ass), a nose that is attached to him brings to him its (the meadow's) fragrance* (Jsh)], i. e. ^{مِنْ} حَيْثُ هَبَّتْ (ML), the *prop.* being suppressed, and ^{مَا} put as a compensation for it (DM). ^{حَيْثُ} when *pre.* to the single term, is *infl.* (R, ML) by some (R), according to IJ (ML), which is said to be the *dial.* of Hudhail (AAz), because the cause of uninflectedness, i. e. prefixion to the *prop.*, is removed (R); and I have seen, in the handwriting of orthographers

أَمَّا تَرَى حَيْثُ سَهِيلٌ طَالِعًا

[above], with Fath of the ف (ML): but in the best known usage it remains *uninfl.*, because prefixion to the single term is anomalous (R). ^{حَيْثُ}, when the res-
tricting مَ is attached to it [181, 565], implies the sense of *condition*, and apocopates two *vs.*, as ^{حَيْثُمَا تَسْتَقِمُ الْخُ}
[419]; and this verse is, according to me, a proof of its denoting *time* (ML), i. e. *In whatever time*, not *In whatever place, thou art straight*, as is proved by ^{فِي غَايِرِ}
^{الْأَزْمَانِ} (DM).

§ 203. ^{مَنْذُ} and ^{مَنْذُ} [both pronounced with Kasr of their م in one *dial.* (Sn)] are used [by the Arabs (IY)] as *ns.* and *ps.* [498] (IY, A), ^{مَنْذُ} mostly as a *p.*, and ^{مَنْذُ} mostly as a *n.* [510]. They are peculiar to *time*, being prefixed only to a [*n. of*] *time*; and their relation to *time* is the same as that of ^{مِنْ} to *place*, ^{مِنْ} denoting *beginning of extent in place* [499], and ^{مَنْذُ} and ^{مَنْذُ} in *time* [510] (IY). When they are *ns.*, they have two meanings, (1) *the beginning of the period*, [with which only *definite time* is allowable (IY),] as ^{مَا رَأَيْتُهُ مَنْذُ يَوْمِ}
^{الْجُمُعَةِ} *I have not seen him since Friday*: (2) *the whole of the period*, [to which the *indet.* is peculiar (IY),] as ^{مَا رَأَيْتُهُ مَنْذُ يَوْمَانِ}
I have not seen him for two days (M);

though you may put a *det.* implying *number*, as ^{لم أره منذ} *لم أره منذ* ^{ص ٨٨٥} *I have not seen him all through the Muharram*, as though you said *for 30 days* (IY). They have three states (ML), being followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*, a *n.* in the *nom.*, or a *prop.* (DM). When they are followed by a *n.* in the *gen.*, they are said by some to be (ML, A) *pre. ns.* (ML), *adv.* governed in the *acc.* by the *v.* before them ; but are held by most to be *preps.* [510] (A). They are *ns.* (1) when they govern [a single *n.* in (A)] the *nom.* : (2) when they are followed by [a *prop.*, *vid.* (A)] (a) the [*pret.* (Sn)] *v.* (IM) with its *ag.*, which is the prevalent [construction], for which reason IM restrict himself to the mention of it ; (b) the *inch.* with its *enunc.* (A). When they are followed by a *n.* in the *nom.*, [as ^{منذ يوم} *منذ يوم* ^{ص ٨٨٥} (ML),] then, (1) [as Mb, IS, and F say (ML),] they are *inchs.* followed by an *enunc.* (ML, A), i. q. (a) ^{الامد} *الامد* if the *time* be *present* or *numbered*, [as ^{ما رأيته منذ يومنا} *ما رأيته منذ يومنا* ^{ص ٨٨٥} or ^{منذ ثلاثة ايام} *منذ ثلاثة ايام* ^{ص ٨٨٥} *I have not seen him all through our day* or *for three days*, i. e. *the term* (of the interruption of the sight) *is our day*, or *three days* (DM)]; (b) ^{اول المدة} *اول المدة* if it be *past* (ML), as ^{مارايته} *مارايته* ^{ص ٨٨٥} *I have not seen him since Friday*, i. e. *the beginning of the period* (of not seeing) *was Friday* (DM) : (a) they are permissible as *inchs.*, because they

are *det.* [25] in letter and sense, or in sense only, according to different opinions (Sn) : (b) this analysis (A, DM) is preferred by IH (DM) ; [and] is indicated by IM's saying "when they govern the *nom.*" (A), because the *inch.* governs the *enunc.* in the *nom.* [24] (Sn) : (2) [as Akh, Zj, and Zji say (ML, Sn),] they are [adverbial (ML)] *enuncs.* followed by an *inch.* (ML, A), i. q. ^{بَيْنَ} ^{وَبَيْنَ} both *pre.*, as ^{مَا لَقَيْتَهُ} ^{مَنْذَرُ} ^{يَوْمَانِ} *I have not met him for two days*, i. e. *Between (me) and meeting (him) [158] have been two days* (ML, Sn) ; but there is no concealing the obscurity involved in this (ML) : (a) ISgh says "he that parses them as *inchs.* or *enuncs.* ought to reckon "them among the necessarily *prepos. inchs.* or *enuncs.* " [28] ; and that can best be accounted for by the argument that, since they must precede the *gen.* when they "are *preps.*, they must precede [the *enunc.* or *inch.*] when "they are *ns.*" (YS) : (3) as most of the KK say, they are *advs. pre.* to a *prop.* whose *v.* is suppressed while its *ag.* remains, the *o. f.* being ^{مَنْذَرُ} ^{كَانَ} ^{يَوْمَانِ} *since two days (have been)*, [where ^{كَانَ} is *att.* (DM), or ^{مَنْذَرُ} ^{مَضَى} ^{يَوْمَانِ} *since two days (have passed)* (A)] ; and this is preferred by Suh and IM (ML, A) in the Tashīl (A) : (4) as some of the KK say, they [or rather the *ns.* after them (DM)] are *enuncs.* of a suppressed [*pron.*, vid. ^{هُوَ} (DM)], i. e. ^{مَا رَأَيْتَهُ} ^{مِنْ} ^{الزَّمَانِ} ^{الَّذِي} ^{هُوَ} ^{يَوْمَانِ} *I have not seen him from that (time which) is two days*, upon the ground that

مُنْذُ is compounded of two words, مِنْ and the Tā'ī نُزْ
[176] (ML), and that مُنْذُ is orig. مُنْذُ (DM). When
they are followed by the verbal or nominal *prop.*, as in
مَا زَالَ مُنْذُ آخِ [112] and

وَمَا زِلْتُ أَبْغِي أَلْمَالَ مُنْذُ أَنَا يافعٌ
وَلَيْدًا وَكَهْلًا حِينِ شَبْتُ وَامْرَدًا

[by ALA'shà, *And I have not ceased to seek wealth, since I was a stripling, when (I was) a boy and middle-aged, when I was hoary, and when (I was) beardless (Jsh)*], then, (1) according to the best known opinion, they are *adv. pre.*, (a) as some say, to the *prop.*, [in which case they are excluded from peculiarity to prefixion to the *n. of time*, and their meaning is *from the time when* (DM)]; (b) as others says, to زَمْنٍ [supplied (Sn)] *pre.* to the *prop.*, [in which case their meaning is *from the beginning (of the time when)* (DM)]; (2) as is said, they are *incls.*, in which case زَمَانٍ must be supplied *pre.* to the *prop.*, as the *enunc.* (ML, A), i. e. *the beginning (of that was the time when) his two hands tied and I was a stripling* (DM). مُنْذُ and مُنْذُ are *uninfl.* because they are *ns.* in the sense of *ps.* [510, 159]. They ought to be quiescent [159]: but [the ذ of] مُنْذُ is mobilized because of the quiescence of the ذ before it, and is pro-

nounced with Damm for alliteration [197] to the Damm of the م ; while مَنْ is quiescent, unless it meet a quiescent after it, in which case it is pronounced with Damm, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ , but by some with Kasr, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ (IY). The *o. f.* of مَنْ is مَنْ , [the ن being elided from it (DM),] as is proved by their [generally (Sn)] reverting to Damm of the ن in مَنْ upon meeting a quiescent, as مَنْ الْيَوْمَ [663], whereas, if the *o. f.* were not Damm, they would pronounce with Kasr [664]; and by the fact that some of them say مَنْ زَمِي طَرِيلُ , pronouncing with Damm notwithstanding the absence of the quiescent (ML, A).

§ 204. اِنْ is of four kinds, (1) a *n.* denoting *past time*, and used in four ways, (a) as an *adv.*, which is the prevalent usage, as IX. 40. [below] : (b) as a direct *obj.* [of a *v.* (a) mentioned (DM)], as اِنْ كُنْتُمْ قَلِيلًا VII. 84. *And remember the time when ye were few, and He made you many* ; [(b) supplied (DM),] the اِنْ mentioned in the beginnings of stories in the Revelation being mostly a direct *obj.* of اِنْ كَرُ supplied, as اِنْ قَالَ II. 28. *And (remember) the time when thy Lord said unto the angels* [below] : (c) as a *subst.* for the *obj.*, as اِنْ كَرُ فِي الْكِتَابِ مَرْيَمُ اِنْ اَنْتَبَذْتَ XIX. 16.

And remember Mary in the Scripture, when she withdrew, [i. e. the time of her withdrawal (DM),] where
أَنْ is a *subst.* of implication for *مَرِيَمَ*, [the *cop.* (154) being the *pron.* relating to her latent in the *v.* (DM),] like the *subst.* in II. 214. [150]; while *أَنْ* in the text
أَنْ كَرَّرَا نِعْمَةَ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ أَنْ جَعَلَ فِيكُمْ أَنْبِيَاءَ V. 23. *Remember ye the grace of God towards you, when He set among you Prophets* may be an *adv.* to, or a [total (DM)] *subst.* for, *نِعْمَةً*: (d) as *post.* to a *n.* of time, (a) capable of being dispensed with, as in *يَوْمَئِذٍ* and *حِينَئِذٍ* [201]; (b) incapable of it, as in *رَبَّنَا لَا تَزِغْ قُلُوبَنَا بَعْدَ أَنْ هَدَيْتَنَا* III. 6. *Our Lord, lead not our hearts astray after the time when Thou hast guided us*: (2) a *n.* denoting future time [201], as *يَوْمَئِذٍ تَكُنُّ أَخْبَارُهَا* XCIX. 4. *On that day shall she tell her tidings*; while the text *فَسَوْفَ يَعْلَمُونَ*
أَنْ الْأَغْلَالُ فِي أَعْنَاقِهِمْ XL. 72. 73. *Therefore they shall know, when the yokes are on their necks* is sometimes cited as evidence, because *يَعْلَمُونَ*, which is future in letter and sense [404], governs *أَنْ*, which must therefore be i. q. *أَنْ*: (3) causative, as *أَنْ يَنْفَعَكُمْ الْيَوْمَ*
ظَلَمْتُمْ أَنْكُمْ فِي الْعَذَابِ مُشْتَرِكُونَ XLIII. 38. *And it shall not profit you to-day, since ye have done wrong, that ye*

are partners in punishment, i. e. *And your partnership in punishment shall not profit you to-day, on account of your wrong-doing in the world* : (a) this ^أإِنَّ is alternatively said to be (a) a *p.*, i. q. the causative ^ع [504] ; (b) an *adv.*, the causation being imported from the force of the sentence, not from the letter, because, when ^أضربته ^أإِذَا ^أإِسَاءَ I beat him when he did evil is said, and ^عtime is meant, the appearance of the case necessarily implies that the *evil-doing* is the cause of the *beating*, [because the dependence of the predicament upon a qualification notifies the *causality* of the latter (DM)] : (b) [^أإِنَّ in the text cannot be causative according to the 2nd saying, and (DM)] the difficulty is removed only according to the 1st saying, because, if *The partnership in punishment shall not profit you to-day in the time of your wrong-doing* were said, causation would not be imported on account of the difference in the *times* of the two acts, [vid. *wrong-doing*, the *time* of which is the *present life*, and *profiting*, the *time* of which is the *next life* : nay, in reality the difference of *time* entirely prevents the coherence of the sentence (DM)] ; and [thus (DM)] a [further (DM)] difficulty remains in the text [according to the 2nd saying (DM)], vid. that ^أإِنَّ is not a *subst.* for ^أالْيَوْمَ, because of the difference in the two ^عtimes ; nor an *adv.* to ^أيَنْفَعُ, because the latter does not

govern two *adv.* [64]; nor to ^أمُشْتَرِكُونَ, because the *reg.* of the *pred.* of the five *ps.* does not precede them [520, 593], nor does the *reg.* of the *conj.* precede the conjunct [75], and because their *partnership* is in the *next life*, not in the *time of their wrong-doing* : (c) other passages attributed to causation are ^أوَإِنْ لَمْ يَهْتَدُوا بِهِ فَنَسِيقُولُوا هَذَا ^أفَكَ قَدِيمٌ XLVI. 10. *And, since they have not been guided by it*, [their perversity has become manifest (B),] *so that they will say, This is an old lie*, XVIII. 15. [88], ^أإِنْ مَحَلًّا ^أأَلَمْ تَصْبُحُوا قَدْ أَلَمَ [107], and ^أإِنْ مَحَلًّا ^أأَلَمْ [35]; and all of that is correct only according to the saying that the causative ^أأَنْ is a *p.*: (4) denotative of *suddenness of occurrence*, as S declares, which is the one [generally] occurring after ^أبَيْنَمَا and ^أبَيْنَمَا, as ^أأَسْتَقْدِرُ اللَّهَ خَيْرًا ^أأَلَمْ [below]; and is variously said to be an *adv.* of *place* or *time*, a *p.* denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, and a *corrob.*, i. e. *red.* [563], *p.*, [as explained by R below]. Two other meanings are mentioned for ^أأَنْ, [in both of which it appears to be a *p.* (DM),] (1) *corroboration*, through its being taken to be *red.*, which is said by AU, followed by IKb [and Jh], who attribute to it certain texts, among them II. 28. [*And thy Lord said* (above) (DM) and II. 48. (below)]; (2) *verification*, like ^أقَدْ [575], to which is attributed the text [XLIII. 38. (above) (DM)]: while

ISh adopts the opinion that it occurs *red.* after ^{أَفْ}بَيْنَا and ^{أَفْ}بَيْنَمَا [below] exclusively ; and, according to the theory of *verification* in the text [XLIII. 38. (DM)], the *prop.* [^{أَفْ}أَنْظَلْتُمْ , i. e. ^{أَفْ}قَدْ ظَلَمْتُمْ *ye have done wrong* (DM),] is a *par.* between the *v.* and *ag.* [1] (ML). ^{أَفْ}أَنْ is always *pre.* to a *prop.* [115] (R, ML), (1) nominal, as ^{أَفْ}وَأَنْزَلْنَاكُمْ أَنْتُمْ قَلِيلٌ VIII. 26. *And remember the time when ye were few:* (2) verbal, its *v.* being a *pret.*, (a) in letter and sense, as II. 28. [above], II. 118 [160], and ^{أَفْ}وَأَنْزَلْنَاكَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ III. 117. *And remember the time when thou wentest early in the morning from thy household ;* (b) in sense, not letter, as II. 121. [539] and ^{أَفْ}وَأَنْزَلْنَاكَ يَوْمَ يَكْفُرُ بِكَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا VIII. 30. *And remember the time when they that disbelieved were plotting against thee :* and all three are combined in ^{أَفْ}وَأَنْزَلْنَاكَ نَصْرَةَ اللَّهِ أَنْ لَا تَنْصُرُوهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ أَنْ أُخْرِجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِي أَثْنَيْنِ أَنْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ أَنْ يَقُولَ IX. 40. *If* [90, 585] *ye help him not, God will help him, as He did help him, when they that disbelieved drave [above] him forth, he being a second of two, when they two were in the* [599] *cave, when he was saying to his companion "Grieve thou not* [419]; *verily God is with us"* (ML). But

they disapprove of [its being prefixed to a *n.* followed by a *pret. v.*, as (R)] اِنْ زَيْدٌ قَامَ (M, R), the chaste construction being اِنْ قَامَ زَيْدٌ (R), because اِنْ, being applied to denote the *past*, should rather be prefixed to the *pret.*, on account of the conformity (IY, R) and affinity (R) of their meanings (IY). Sometimes one of the two terms of the *prop.* is suppressed, so that, [when the inflection is not apparent in the other term (DM),] the ignorant think that اِنْ is *pre.* to the single term, as

هَلْ تَرْجِعُنَّ لِيَالٍ قَدْ مَضَيْنَ لَنَا
وَالْعَيْشُ مُنْقَلَبٌ اِنْ ذَاكَ اَفْنَانًا

[by 'Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu'tazz, *Shall nights* (i.e. *times*), *that have passed for us, indeed return, when life is changed—since that (is so)—like branches?*, i.e. *since life is like branches, sometimes fresh, and sometimes dry* (Jsh)], in full اِنْ ذَاكَ كَذَلِكَ, and

كَانَتْ مَنَازِلُ الْاَلَفِ عَهْدَتَهُمْ
اِنْ نَحْنُ اِنْ ذَاكَ دُونَ النَّاسِ اِخْوَانًا

by AlAkhtal, i.e. *They were abodes of familiar friends, that I knew as brothers above mankind, when we (were familiar together), when that neighbourhood (was existing)*, in full اِنْ نَحْنُ مُتَالِفُونَ اِنْ ذَاكَ كَانُوا, what is

demonstrated by ذَاكَ being the *neighbourhood* understood from the sentence, and

كَلَّا لَمْ يَكُونُوا حِمًى يَتَّقَى * إِنْ النَّاسُ إِنْ ذَاكَ مِنْ عِزِّ بَرٍّ

by AlKhansá, i.e. *As though they were not a sanctuary that is respected, when mankind are such that he of them that overcomes robs, when that* [overcoming (DM)] (is existing), in full إِنْ ذَاكَ كَانَتْ (ML): and sometimes the [whole (ML)] *prop.* is suppressed, because known, and Tanwin is put as a compensation for it, [as

نَهَيْتُكَ عَنْ طَلَابِكَ أُمِّ عَمْرٍ * بِعَافِيَةٍ وَأَنْتَ إِنْ صَحِيحٌ

(R), by Abū Dhu'aib alHudhalī, *I prohibited thee, O heart, from thy courting Umm 'Amr in health, while thou wast then well* (Jsh),] in which case the ذ [of إِنْ (R)] is

pronounced with Kasr [608] (R, ML) or Fath [201]; but

always with Kasr in such as يَوْمُنْ (R), as يَوْمُنْ يَفْرَحُ

XXX. 3. *And on that day shall the believers*

be glad (ML), i. e. وَيَوْمَ يَغْلِبُ الرُّومُ *And on the day*

when (the Greeks shall overcome) [502] (B). إِنْ is not

like إِنْ in denoting *condition*, [because its *time* is *past*,

while *condition* is *future* (IY),] unless it be restrained

[by مَ from prefixion (IY)], as in the saying of Al'Abbās

Ibn Mirdās [as Sulamī (Jsh)]

اِذَا دَخَلْتَ عَلَى الرَّسُولِ فَقُلْ لَهُ
حَقًّا عَلَيْكَ اِذَا اَطْلَمَانِ الْمَجْلِسِ

(M) *Whenever thou enterest before the Apostle, say thou to him, with a saying that has become necessarily incumbent (in full* ^{حَقًّا} *لَكَ قَوْلًا حَقًّا*, i. e. ^{رَجَبٌ وَجُوبًا}) *upon thee, when the assembly is still (AAz), because, being restrained by* ^{مَا} *from the prefixion [565] explanatory of its sense, it becomes vague (IY). اِذَا is an instrument of condition, that [seldom (DM)] apocopates two* *vs. (ML), being mostly inop. (DM). It is, (1) according to S, a p. [419], i. q. [the cond. (ML)] اِنْ (R on the apoc., ML); (2) according to Mb, IS, and F, an* *ad (ML): (a) perhaps S considers that, when the word* ^{مَا} *is affixed to اِذَا, the latter already contains the sense of condition, and is future, even if it be prefixed to the pret., like اِنْ; so that it becomes an apocopative with* ^{مَا} *: whereas this cannot be the case with اِذَا, which is devoid of the sense of condition, and is applied to denote the past; so that اِذَا, according to him, is not compounded: (b) Sf says "I have not known any of the GG mention اِذَا, except S and his school; and S cites [only] two* *verses, اِذَا دَخَلْتَ الْخ [above] and اِذَا تَرَيَنِي الْيَوْمَ الْخ*

“ [589]: and one of the GG says that its *o. f.* is ^{اَما}, which
 “ does not occur except with the *corrob.* ^و after it [613],
 “ as in XIX. 26. [544]; so that, since [the metre of]
 “ the verse would be violated by the ^و, the form of ^{اَما}
 “ is changed by conversion of the 1st ^م into ^ذ; but this
 “ [explanation] is not complete in ^{اِذَا دَخَلْتَ الْغ}: (c)
 Mb says that [^{اِذَا} in ^{اِذَا}] retains its nominality; but
 that ^{ما} restrains it from seeking prefixion, and adapts it to
condition and apocopation, as in the case of ^{حَيْثُ} [202];
 for by means of ^{ما} it becomes future and apocopative
 (R). Its government of the *apoc.* [419] is rare [in prose
 and poetry (DM)]; but is not a poetic license, contrary
 to the opinion of some. ^{اِذَا} is used in two ways:—
 (1) it denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, in which case [it
 differs from the *cond.* ^{اِذَا} in four matters, vid. that (DM)]
 it is peculiar to nominal ^{props.}, does not need a *correl.*,
 nor occur at the beginning [of the sentence (DM)], and
 means the *present*, not the *future*, (i. e. indicates that
what follows it is realized during the realization of what
precedes it, as Shm demonstrates, even if they be both
past (DM),] as ^{خَرَجْتُ فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ بِالْبَابِ} *I went out; and*
 [540] *lo, or there, or then, the* [599] *lion was at the door,*
 whence ^{فَالْقَاهَا فَإِذَا آخُ}; XX. 21. *Then he cast it down,*

and behold, or there, or then, it etc. [31] and ^{اِذَا} ^{اِذْقَنَا} ^{وَاِذَا} ^{اِذْقَنَا} X. 22. And, when we make the people [of Makka (DM)] to taste of mercy after a hardship that has befallen them, lo, or there, or then, they have a plot: (a) it is (a) a *p.* according to Akh, which is made preferable by their saying ^{خَرَجْتُ} ^{فَاِذَا} ^{اِنْ} ^{زَيْدًا} ^{بِالْبَابِ} I went out, and lo, verily Zaid was at the door, [like the version ^{فَاِذَا} ^{اِنَّهُ} ^{عَبْدُ} ^{الْقَفَا} ^{اَلخ} (519),] with Kasr of [the Hamza in] ^{اِنْ}, because, [if it were not a *p.*, it would be an *adv.* of *time* or *place*, and would therefore need an *op.*, whereas what precedes the ^ف does not govern what follows it, and (DM,) what follows ^{اِنْ} does not govern what precedes it; (b) an *adv.* of *place*, according to Mb; (c) an *adv.* of *time*, according to Zj [and Rm, which opinion is attributed to S (DM)]: and the 1st opinion is adopted by IM, the 2nd by IU, and the 3rd by Z: (b) he [i. e. Z (DM)] asserts that its *op.* is a supplied *v.* derived from the letter of ^{اَلْمَفَاجَاةُ}, saying that XXX. 24. ^{ثُمَّ} ^{اِذَا} ^{دُعَاكُمْ} ^{دَعْوَةً} ^{مِّنْ} ^{اَلْاَرْضِ} ^{اِذَا} ^{اَنْتُمْ} ^{تَخْرُجُونَ} Moreover, when [below] He shall call you once from the earth, then ye shall come forth is constructively ^{ثُمَّ} ^{اِذَا} Moreover, when etc, ye shall fall suddenly to coming forth in that time :

but others hold that its *op.* is the *enunc.*, mentioned, as in ^٩فَإِذَا زَيْدٌ جَالِسٌ, or supplied, as in ^٩فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ, i. e. ^٩حَاضِرٌ; and that, when ^٩إِذَا itself is construed to be the *enunc.* [in such as ^٩فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ (DM)], its *op.* is ^٩مُسْتَقَرٌّ or ^٩اِسْتَقَرَّ [26, 498]: (c) the *enunc.* with it always occurs expressed in the Revelation, as XXI. 97. [160], ^٩فَإِذَا هُمْ خَامِدُونَ XXXVI. 28. And lo, or there, or then, they were still, and ^٩فَإِذَا هِيَ بَيْضَاءُ VIII. 105. And lo, or there, or then, it was white: (d) when ^٩فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ خَرَجَتْ I went forth, and there was the lion! is said, ^٩إِذَا may be an *enunc.* according to Mb, i. e. ^٩فَإِذَا لِحَضْرَةِ الْأَسَدِ; but not according to Zj, because the [*adv.* of] time is not an *enunc.* of a concrete *n.* [26]; nor according to Akh, because the *p.* is neither predicable nor predicable of [497]: whereas, if you say ^٩فَإِذَا الْقَتَالُ and there, or then, was fighting, [like the version ^٩إِذَا أَنْتَ عَبْدُ الْقَفَا الْخ (519) with Fath,] it may be an *enunc.* according to others than Akh: (e) you say ^٩فَإِذَا زَيْدٌ جَالِسٌ or ^٩جَالِسًا I went forth, and there, or then, Zaid was sitting, or and there was Zaid, sitting, or and then Zaid (was present) sitting, with (a) the *nom.* as an *enunc.*, ^٩إِذَا being gov-

erved in the *acc.* by it: (b) the *acc.* as a *d. s.*, the *enunc.* being إِذَا, if it be called an [*adv. of*] *place*; and, if not, then suppressed, [i. e. حَاضِرٌ (DM)]: (f) you may construe إِذَا to be an *enunc.* of a concrete *n.* [in appearance, but of an abstract *n.* in reality (DM)], notwithstanding our calling it an [*adv. of*] *time* [26], when you assume the suppression of a *pre. n.*, as خَرَجْتُ فَإِذَا الْأَسَدُ I went forth, and then was (the presence of) the lion, constructively قَدْ كُنْتُ أَطْنِي : (g) the Arabs say أَشَدَّ الْعَقْرَبِ أَشَدَّ لِسْعَةً مِنَ الزُّنْبُورِ فَإِذَا هُوَ هَيَّ فَإِذَا هُوَ أَيَّاهَا also: but this [2nd (DM)] construction was disapproved by S when he was questioned by Ks; and فَإِذَا هُوَ هَيَّ is the proper construction, like VII. 105. and XX. 21; while فَإِذَا هُوَ أَيَّاهَا, if authentic, is irregular and inelegant, like the government of the *apoc.* by لَنْ [549], the *subj.* by لَمْ [548], and the *gen.* by لَعَلَّ [513] (ML): (h) إِذَا [denoting *suddenness of occurrence* (IY)] is used like the ف in the *correl.* of the condition, [because of the approximation of their meanings, *suddenness of occurrence* and *succession* (IY),] as XXX. 35. [1, 419] (M)

and XXX. 24. [above] (K, B): (2) it denotes *something else than suddenness of occurrence*, in which case (a) it is mostly an *adv.* of the *future*, implying the sense of *condition*, and peculiar to prefixion to verbal *props.*, being [in all of this] contrary to the one that denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, with which it is combined in XXX. 24. [above] and عَبَادَةٍ مِّنْ يَّشَاءُ مِّنْ عِبَادَةٍ XXX. 47. [below] *And, when He watereth with it those of His servants whom He willeth, lo, or there, or then, they are glad!* (ML): (a) as اِذَا is prefixed to the *pret.*, so it is prefixed to the *aor.* (K, B on XLII. 28), as XCII. 1. [498], whence وَهُوَ عَلَىٰ جَمْعِهِمْ اِذَا يَشَاءُ قَدِيرٌ XLII. 28. *And He, when He willeth, is able to gather them together and*

وَإِذَا مَا أِشَاءُ أَبْعَثُ مِنْهَا * آخِرَ اللَّيْلِ نَاشِطًا مَّذْعُورًا

(K) *And, whenever I will, I rouse her (the she-camel) for the journey at the end of the night, so that she speeds along as though she were a terrified wild bull* (N); [but] the *v.* after it is often a *pret.*, and less often an *aor.*, both of which are combined in the saying of Abū Dhu'aib [alHudhali (Jsh¹)

وَالنَّفْسُ رَاغِبَةٌ إِذَا رَغِبَتْهَا * وَإِذَا تَرَدَّ إِلَىٰ قَلِيلٍ تَقْنَعُ

[*And the soul of man is craving when thou makest it crave; and, when it is reduced to a little, it is content*

(Jsh)]: (b) the *cond.* إِذَا is prefixed to the *n.* in such as LXXXIV. 1. [23, 201] only because the *n.* is an *ag.* to a *v.* suppressed upon condition of being expounded, not an *inch.*, contrary to the opinion of Akh, [who allows إِذَا to be prefixed to the *inch.* provided that the latter be followed by a *v.* (DM)]; and, as for the saying [of AlFarazdak (Mb, Jsh)]

إِذَا بَاهِلِي تَحْتَهُ حَنْظَلِيَّةٌ * لَهُ وَلَدٌ مِنْهَا فَذَاكَ الْمَدْرَعُ

[When a man of the tribe of Bāhila, under whom is a woman of the tribe of Ḥanzāla, has a child by her, that child will be the mail-clad warrior, where the *n.* mentioned after إِذَا is not followed by a *v.*, بَاهِلِي is not an *inch.*, but (DM)] the full phrase is إِذَا كَانَ بَاهِلِي (ML), so that بَاهِلِي is *sub.* of كَانَ, the *pred.* of which is لَهُ وَلَدٌ (DM): (c) إِذَا does not govern the *apoc.*, [notwithstanding its signifying *condition*, and being i. q. مَتَى (206) (R),] except in poetry (R, ML), as

أَسْتَغْنِي مَا أَغْنَاكَ رَبُّكَ بِالْغَنَى * وَإِذَا تُصِيبَكَ خُصَاصَةٌ فَتَجَمَّلْ

[by 'Abd Kāis Ibn Khufāf {alBurjūmī (T)}, admonishing his son Jamīl, *Be content with competence, so long as thy Lord gives thee a competence; and, when poverty befalls thee, show resignation* (Jsh)]: (b) it is said to be

sometimes excluded from *adverbiality*, *futurity*, and the sense of *condition*; and each of these shall have a separate paragraph: (a) as for its exclusion from *adverbiality*, Akh asserts on XXXIX. 71. 73. [539] that اِذَا is [a n. of time (DM)] governed in the gen. by حَتَّى [below], [i. e. *Until the time of their coming to it (DM)*]; and IJ asserts on the reading اِذَا وَقَعَتِ الرُّوُقَةُ لَيْسَ LVI. 1-3. *The time when the resurrection shall come to pass, while not a lying (soul) shall be at* [the ل being i. q. فِى (DM)] *its coming to pass, abasing some, exalting others, will be the time when the earth shall be shaken with violent shaking* that the 1st اِذَا is an *inch.* and the 2nd an *enunc.*, the two accs. being *ds. s.*, as likewise is the *prop.* of لَيْسَ and its two *regs.* [لَوْقَعَتَهَا كَاذِبَةٌ (DM)], i. e. *The time of the resurrection's coming to pass will be the time of the earth's being shaken*; and they say on the verse of the Hamāsi [Abu-ṭTamīm alKainī (T)]

وَقَبْلَ غَدٍ يَا لَهْفَ نَفْسِي عَلَى غَدٍ

اِذَا رَاحَ أَصْحَابِي وَلَسْتُ بِرَائِعٍ

[*And before the morrow—O the grief of my soul for the morrow, for the time when my companions will return, and I shall not be returning!* (T)] that اِذَا is in the position

of a *gen.* as a *subst.* for [the 2nd] ^{عَدَّ} , [or of an *acc.* as a *subst.* for the position of ^{عَدَّ} عَلَى (498) (T)]; and IM asserts that it occurs as an *obj.* in the saying of the Prophet to 'Ā'isha ^{إِنِّي لَأَعْلَمُ إِذَا كُنْتُ عَنِّي رَاضِيَةً وَإِذَا} ^{كُنْتُ عَلَى غَضَبِي} Verily I do know the time when thou art pleased with me, and the time when thou art in anger against me: (b) its exclusion from *futurity* is through its denoting (a) the *past*, as ^{إِذَا} denotes the *future*, as IX. 93. [80], LXII. 11. [538] ^{وَنَدَمَانِ يَزِيدُ الْخ} And, when they saw etc., they dispersed etc., and [18]: (β) the *present*, vid. after the oath [from God, as will be seen (DM),] as XCII. 1. [498] and ^{وَالنَّجْمِ إِذَا هَوَى} LIII. 1. By the Pleiades [11] when they set [below], because, as is said, if it denoted the *future*, it would not be an *adv.* to the *v.* of the oath, [i. e. ^{اقْسَمَ} (DM),] because this *v.* is origina^١tive, not enunciat^٢ory of an oath to come, since the oath of God is ancient; nor to a suppressed *being* serving as a *d. s.* to ^{الَّيْلِ} and ^{النَّجْمِ}, because the ^{حَالِ} and the *future* are incompatible: whereas the truth is that dependence upon the origina^٣tive ^{اقْسَمَ} is not correct, because the ancient has no *time*, either *present* or *other-wise*, being anterior to *time*; but that dependence upon ^{كَانَتْ}, notwithstanding that ^{إِذَا} remains in the *future*, is

not impossible, [because the *حال* incompatible with the future is the *temporal*, not the *grammatical* one (DM), i. e. the *present time*, not the *d. s.*,] as is proved by the fact that the occurrence of the presumptive *d. s.* [74] is correct by common consent: (c) the exclusion of *إِذَا* from *conditionality* is exemplified in *وَإِذَا مَا غَضِبُوا هُمْ* ^{XLII. 35.} *And who, when they are wroth, forgive* and *وَالَّذِينَ إِذَا أَصَابَهُمُ الْبَغْيُ هُمْ يَفْتَصِرُونَ* ^{XLII. 37.} *And who, when wrong befalls them, help themselves*, in both of which *إِذَا* is an *adv.* to the *enunc.* of the *inch.* after it; whereas, if it were *cond.*, and the nominal *prop.* a *correl.*, this *prop.* would be conjoined with the *ف* [but see (f) below]: and hence the *إِذَا* that follows the oath, as in XCII. 1. and LIII. 1. [above] (ML): (c) since the introduction of the sense of *condition* into *إِذَا* and its exclusion from its original sense of *specified time* [206] are frequent, it may, even if it be not i. q. the *cond.* *إِن*, vid. in the case of *decided matters*, be used in the same way as the *إِذَا* implying the sense of *إِن*, vid. in being followed by two *props.* in the guise of the *prot.* and *apod.*, although they are not such, as CX. 1-3. [540], in order that this arrangement may indicate that the purport of the 2nd *prop.* is as inseparable from the purport of

the 1st *prop.* as the *apod.* from the *prot.*; and it is for the realization of this object that [the *non-cond.*] اِذَا is governed by its [apparent] *apod.*, notwithstanding that the latter follows a *p.* such that what precedes it is not governed by what follows it, like the ف in CX. 3., اِنَّ in اِذَا جِئْتَنِي فَاتَّكَ مَكْرَمٌ When thou comest to me, verily thou wilt be honored, and the ل in XIX. 67. [600] (R):

(d) what governs اِذَا [in the *acc.* (ML)] is (a) its *prot.*, [as some say (R), which is the opinion of critical judges (ML),] so that it is like مَتَى [206] (R, ML), and accordingly should be parsed not as “a *n.* of *time* governing “its *prot.* in the *gen.*, and governed in the *acc.* by its “*correl.*,” but only as “a *n.* of *condition* governed in the “*acc.* by its *prot.*” (DM); and the objection of AB that this opinion is refuted by the fact that the *pre.* is not governed by the *post.* does not apply, because اِذَا according to these [critical judges (DM)] is not *pre.* [201], as all say when it governs the *apoc.*, as in اِسْتَعْنِي مَا آتَاكَ اِذَا [above] (ML): (b) [the *v.* or the like in (ML)] its *apod.*, which is the saying of most (R, ML), but is open to various objections (ML): it is best, however, to make a distinction, and say that, if اِذَا implies the sense of *condition*, its predicament is like that of مَتَى; but that, if not, as in اِذَا غَرَبَتِ الشَّمْسُ جِئْتَكَ When the sun sets

I will come to thee, i. e. *I will come to thee at the time of the setting of the sun*, its *op.* is the *v.* that is in the place of an *apod.* by usage, though it is not an *apod.* in reality, not the *v.* that is in the place of the *prot.*, since this *v.* particularizes the *adv.* by being *post.* to it [111], as in the case of the rest of the *advs.* epithetically particularized [140] by the purport of the *props.* after them, as ^{يَوْمَ يَجْمَعُ اللَّهُ الرُّسُلَ} يوم يجمع الله الرسل V. 108. *On the day when God will assemble the Apostles*, and the *post.* does not govern the *pre.*: for in every two or more words, that are equivalent in sense to a single word, because they occur together as a part of a sentence, the 1st may govern the 2nd, as the *pre.* governs the *post.* [110]; but the converse is not allowable, since no single word is known one of whose parts is *prepos.* in one respect and *postpos.* in another, and similarly therefore what is equivalent to a single word in sense, for which reason a *conj.* does not govern a conjunct, nor an *appos.* an *ant.*, nor a *post.* a *pre.*: whereas the *cond.* word, when governed by the *prot.*, is not together with the *prot.* like a single word, since they do not then occur in the place of a single word, like the *ag.*, *obj.*, *inch.*, and the like; so that each of them may govern the other, as ^{مَتَى تَذْهَبْ أَذْهَبْ} متى تذهب أذهب and XVII. 110. [116]: (e) the *ف* in such as CX. 3. [540] is [not illative, but] *red.*, because the illative *ف* is not devoid of the sense of *succession*, whereas ^{إِذَا جَاءَ} إذا جاء

becoming by means of **مَا** an apocopative word distinctly *cond.*: but some say that **إِذَا** is [distinctly] *cond.*, and therefore apocopates [the *v.* of] the *prot.* and *apod.*; and they cite the saying of AlFarazdaq

فَقَامَ أَبُو لَيْلَى إِلَيْهِ ابْنُ ظَالِمٍ
وَكَانَ إِذَا يَسْلُلُ السَّيْفَ يَضْرِبُ

Then *Abū Lailā*, the son of *Zālim*, arose to help him; and he was wont, whenever he drew the sword, to smite, whereas the [true] version is **مَتَيْنًا** [206]. **إِذَا** and **إِن** occur in the *correl.* of **بَيْنَا** [497] and **يَيْنَا** [565]; and each of them then denotes *suddenness of occurrence*: but **إِن** mostly occurs in the *correl.* of **يَيْنَا**, [as **يَيْنَمَا نَحْنُ** **فَبَيْنَا نَسُوسُ آلَ ح** (565),] and **إِذَا** in that of **بَيْنَا**, as **فَبَيْنَا نَسُوسُ آلَ ح** [497]; while **إِن** is followed only by the *pret. v.*, and **إِذَا** by the nominal [*prop.*] (R). But As used to hold that the only chaste [idiom] was to omit them in the *correl.* of **بَيْنَا** and **يَيْنَا** (M, R), because the *correl.* frequently occurs without them (R), as in

فَبَيْنَا نَحْنُ نَرْقُبُهُ أَتَانَا * مُعَلِّقٌ وَفُضَّةٌ وَزِنَادٌ رَاغٍ

(M), by a man of the Banū Kais 'Ailān, *Then, while we were expecting him, he came to us, dangling a wallet*

and a herdsman's fire-sticks (Jsh), and ^{بَيْنَا تَعْنَقَهُ الْكَمَاةُ الْخ}

[497] (IY). The [idiom] heard from the Arabs is

^{بَيْنَا زَيْدٌ قَامَ جَاءَ عَمْرُو} without ^{اِنْ}, because the sense is

Between the intervals of the time [when Zaid stood]

'Amr came, whence ^{بَيْنَا تَعْنَقَهُ الْخ}; whereas ^{بَيْنَمَا} occurs

sometimes not combined with ^{اِنْ}, like ^{بَيْنَا}, and some-

times combined with ^{اِنْ} or ^{اِذَا}, as

^{فَاسْتَقْبِرِ الْمَلَائِكَةَ خَيْرًا وَأَرْضِيئَ بِهِ * فَبَيْنَمَا الْحَسَرُ اِنْ دَارَتْ مَيَاسِيرُ}

^{وَبَيْنَمَا الْمَرْءُ فِي الْاَحْيَاءِ مَغْتَبَطٌ * اِذَا هُوَ الرَّمْسُ تَعْفُورَةُ الْاَعَاصِيرِ}

[above] (D), by 'Ithyar Ibn Labīd al'Udhri, or Huraith

Ibn Jabala, *Then pray thou God to decree thee good,*

and do thou be satisfied with it; for, while there was

hardship, there, or then, or lo, easy times came round!

And, while man is envied for his prosperity among living

beings, there, or then, or lo, he is the dust that the

whirlwinds obliterate! (Jsh). Since ^{بَيْنَ}, which is

always *pre.* to the single term, is intended to be *pre.* to

the *prop.*, and prefixion to the *prop.* is like no prefixion

[201, 202], the restraining ^{لَا} is redundantly affixed to

it [565]; or the Fatha is impleted [497], so that an ^{اِ}

is engendered, in order that the ^{اِ} may indicate that ^{بَيْنَ}

does not require a *post.* [n.], because it is as it were

paused upon, and the { is sometimes put for pause, as in
 اِنَّ [161, 497, 615, 648]. يِّنْ, being *orig.* an *inf. n.*
 meaning *separation*, is used to denote *time* and *place* ;
 whereas, when restrained by مَ or the {, and *pre.* to
props., it denotes only *time*, because no [*n.* of] *place* is
pre. to *props.*, except حَيْثُ [124, 201] : but يِّنْ is really
pre. to a *n.* of *time pre.* to the *prop.*, the full phrase
 being يِّنْ اَرْقَاتِ زَيْدٍ قَائِمٌ *Between (the times when) Zaid*
was standing, i. e. *Between the times of Zaid's standing* ;
 and the *n.* of *time* being suppressed because indicated by
 the circumstance that *ns. pre.* to *props.* are mostly *ns.*
 of *time*, not *ns.* of *place* and others. All that we have
 said about يِّنْمَا, as to the occurrence of the restraining
 مَ in order to restrain it from requiring a single *post. n.*,
 and as to supplying a *n.* of *time pre.* to the *props.*,
 is equally applicable to كَلَّمَا [117, 181] : but since كَلَّمَا
 contains the sense of *generality* and *totality*, which is
 contained in *cond.* words, like مَتَى [206], مَا, and مَتَى,
 it resembles them more than يِّنْمَا does ; so that it is
 prefixed only to the verbal [*prop.*], contrary to يِّنَا and
 يِّنْمَا ; and for the same reason the *pret.* after it may
 occur in the sense of the *future* [615]. يِّنْمَا, يِّنَا, and
 كَلَّمَا are prefixed to the *pret.* and *future*. We may hazard

the conjecture that [^{كَلَّ} and ^{بَيْنَ} in] ^{بَيْنَا}, ^{بَيْنَمَا}, and ^{كَلَّمَا} are *uninfl.*, because their prefixion [to a *prop.*] is like no prefixion, as we said of ^{حَيْثُ} [202], except that they are *uninfl.* upon the Fath that they were entitled to in the state of inflection, contrary to ^{حَيْثُ}, because no state of inflection exists for the latter in which it is governed in the *acc.*, so that its inflectional vowel might be observed. ^{بَيْنَا}, ^{بَيْنَمَا} and ^{كَلَّمَا} with their two *props.* are arranged in the same way as *cond.* words with the *prot.* and *apod.*, in order to explain that the purport of the 2nd is as inseparable from [the purport of] the 1st as the *apod.* from the *prot.*; and for this reason ^{اِذَا} and ^{اِذَا} are prefixed to the *correl.* of ^{بَيْنَا} and ^{بَيْنَمَا}, in order that they may indicate the *conjunction of the purport of the 2nd with [the purport of] the 1st suddenly, without delay*, so that the *correl.* may be more confirmed in the sense of inseparability. But [^{كَلَّمَا} ٦ ^{كَلَّ}] is said to be [*pre.* to a single term, and therefore] *infl.*, ^{مَا} being infinitival, and a *n. of time pre.* to ^{مَا} being supplied [571]; and the like may therefore be asserted of ^{بَيْنَمَا}. When ^{اِذَا} and ^{اِذَا} denoting *suddenness of occurrence* are prefixed to the *correl.*, then, if you say, as Mb holds, that ^{اِذَا} is an *adv. of place*, as likewise he ought to say

of ^ااِنْ , they are governed in the *acc.* as *advs.* of *place* to what follows them, while ^ببَيْنَا and ^ييُنْمَا are *advs.* of *time* to it, so that the sense of ^ااِنْ رَاىَ هِنْدًا ^ببَيْنَا زَيْدٌ قَائِمٌ ^ييُنْمَا *While Zaid was standing, there he saw Hind is Zaid saw Hind between (the times of) his standing, [saw her] in that place, i. e. in the place of his standing; and, if we say, as Zj holds, that they are advs. of time, they are pre. to the prop. after them, excluded from adverbiality, incls. whose enunc. is ^ببَيْنَا or ^ييُنْمَا, the sense being [While etc., was the time when he saw Hind, i. e.] The time of Zaid's seeing Hind was between (the times of) his standing: but it is best to say, as IBr holds, that they are ps., in which case the op. of ^ببَيْنَا and ^ييُنْمَا is what follows the two words denoting suddenness of occurrence; or we may say that ^ااِنْ and ^ااِنْ are *red.*, and do not denote suddenness of occurrence ^عin the correl. of ^ببَيْنَا and ^ييُنْمَا, as AU, IKb, and Jh say that ^ااِنْ is *red.* in such as ^ااِنْ وَاَعَدْنَا II. 48. And We appointed, and ^ااِنْ in such as*

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا اسْلَكُوهُم فِي قَتَاةٍ * شَلَا كَمَا تَطُرُ الْجَمَالَةُ الشَّرِي

[by 'Abd Manāf {Ibn Rib' (Bk)} alHudhalī (Bk, N), Until they made them pass through the mountain-road named *Kutā'ida*, driving them along, as the owners of camels urge on the shying ones (N)]. And the analysis

op. and *post.*], because ^ااِنْ is then a *p.*, exactly like the ^فف [540]. Sometimes ^ااِنْ denotes *suddenness of occurrence* in something else than the *correl.* of ^ييُنَا and ^ييُنَمَا, as ^ككُنْتُ ^واَقْبَا ^ااِنْ جَاوَنِي ^ععَمْرُو *I was standing still: there, or then, or lo, 'Amr came to me.* And ^ييُنَا may be *pre.* to the *inf. n.*, contrary to ^ييُنَمَا, as ^ييُنَا ^تتَعَانَقَهُ [497], in full ^ببَيْنَ ^ااَرْقَاتِ ^تتَعَانَقَهُ *between (the times of) his embracing;* but the best known [version] is the *nom.*, as an *inch.* whose *enunc.* is suppressed, i. e. ^ييُنَا ^تتَعَانَقَهُ ^ححَاصِلٌ *while his embracing (was being realized) (R).*

§ 205. ^ععِنْدُ is i. q. ^للَدُنْ [115], except that it is peculiar in 6 matters (A):—(1) it [always (A)] denotes *beginning of extent* (R, IA, A) in *time* or *place* (R, IA, Sn), as ^للَدُنْ ^صصَبَاحٍ *From daybreak* and ^ممِنْ ^للَدُنْ ^ححَكِيمٍ ^ععَلِيمٍ XXVII. 6. *From a wise, knowing One* (R), thereby differing from ^ممِنْ [499] (R, Sn), as we [i. e. the BB] say (R); and hence ^ععِنْدُ and ^للَدُنْ alternate in such as ^ججِئْتُ ^ممِنْ and hence ^ععِنْدُ or ^ممِنْ ^للَدُنْ, [vid. when the inceptive ^ممِنْ is prefixed to ^ععِنْدُ (Sn),] e. g. ^ااَتَيْنَا ^ررَحْمَةً ^ممِنْ ^ععِنْدِنَا ^ووَعَلَّمَنَا ^ععِنْدُ (Sn),] e. g. ^ااَتَيْنَا ^ررَحْمَةً ^ممِنْ ^ععِنْدِنَا ^ووَعَلَّمَنَا ^ععِنْدُ (Sn),] e. g. XVIII. 64. *Unto whom We had vouchsafed mercy from Us, and whom We had taught knowledge*

from *Us*, contrary to جَلَسْتُ عَنْدَهُ I sat by him, where جَلَسْتُ اَدْنَاهُ is not allowable, because the sense of *beginning* is wanting here (A): but, when *pre.* to the *prop.*, اَدْنَاهُ becomes purely denotative of *time*, because the only *adv. of place pre. to the prop.* is حَيْثُ [124, 201], as

صَرِيعٌ غَوَايٍ رَاقِهَةٌ وَرَقْنَةٌ
لَدُنْ شَبِّ حَتَّى شَابَ سُوْدُ الذَّرَائِبِ

[by AlKutāmi, *Smitten by blooming maids, that he pleased, and that pleased him, from the time that he became a youth until the black locks grew white* (FA)]; while the *prop.* may be headed by an infinitival *p.* [201], since اَدْنَاهُ is not *orig.* purely denotative of *time*, as

فَإِنَّ الْكَثْرَ اَعْيَانِي قَدِيمًا * وَلَمْ اَقْتَرِ لَدُنْ اِنِي غَلَامٌ

by 'Amr Ibn Ḥassān, *For verily wealth eluded me of old; nor was I poor from the time that I was a young man* (R): (2) it is mostly used governed in the *gen.* by مِنْ (IA, A); and therefore does not occur in the *Kur* except with مِنْ, as XVIII. 64. and لِيُنْذِرَ بَأْسًا شَدِيدًا مِنْ, as XVIII. 2. *That it may warn them that disbelieve of a grievous chastisement proceeding from Him* (IA): (3) it is *uninfl.* (R, IA, A), according to most of the Arabs (IA), either, as IH says, because some of its

dial. vars. are constituted like the *p.* [159], and the rest assimilated to them, otherwise there would be no reason for its uninflectedness, because it is like ^{أَ}عِنْدَ, which is *infl.* by common consent; or, as I think (R), because it [exceeds the rest of the aplastic *advs.* (64), and (R)] resembles the *p.* [159], in aplasticity, being not only aplastic, [i. e. not excluded from adverbiality, except by being governed in the *gen.* by ^{أَ}مِنْ (IA),] but also inseparable from the sense of *beginning* (R, IA) of *extent*, and not predicable [see (6) below] (IA): but *Kais* inflect it (R, IA, A), by assimilation to ^{أَ}عِنْدَ (Sn); and hence the reading [of Abū Bakr on the authority of 'Āṣim (IA, Sn)] ^{أَ}مِنْ لَدُنْهُ XVIII. 2. (IA, A) with the ڤ quiescent, but made to smack of *Damm* (IA, Sn); and possibly the saying [of a *Tā'ī Rājiz* (FA)]

تَنْتَهَضُ الرَّعْدَةُ فِي ظَهْرِ ي * مِنْ لَدُنِ الظُّهْرِ إِلَى الْعَصِيرِ

(IA) *The shivering fit of ague comes on in my poor back from the time of noon until near the evening* (J): (4) it may be *pre.* to *props.* [below]: (5) it may be *aprothetic* [in letter and sense (Sn)] before ^{أَ}غَدُوَّة [below]: (6) it occurs only as a complement [see (3) above]: you say ^{أَ}السَّفَرُ مِنْ عِنْدِ الْبَصْرَةِ *The journey is from AlBaṣra*, but not ^{أَ}مِنْ لَدُنِ الْبَصْرَةِ (A). It has 8 *dial. vars.*, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, the

original and best known one, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, ^{أَ}لَدُنْ, and ^{أَ}لَدُنْ; but elision of its ^{أَ} is not allowable when it is *pre.* to a *pron.* (R). Being always *pre.* [115] (IM), ^{أَ}لَدُنْ governs [what follows it in (R)] the *gen.* (IM, R) by prothesis [110] (R, IA, A), (1) literally, if it be a [single (R) *infl.* (A)] *n.*, [as XXVII. 6. and ^{أَ}لَدُنْ ^{أَ}تَذْكُرُ (above) (A)]: (2) constructively, if it be (a) a *prop.* (R, A), as

وَتَذْكُرُ نِعْمَةً لَدُنْ أَنْتَ يَا نَعِمْ

And thou rememberest his bounty, since thou wast a strippling and ^{أَ}لَدُنْ ^{أَ}صَرِيحٌ غَوَايَ; (b) *uninfl.*, as XVIII. 64. and XVIII. 2. (A). But [the word (R)] ^{أَ}لَدُنْ after ^{أَ}غَدُوَّةٌ may be governed in (1) the *gen.* [by prothesis (A), according to rule (IA, A)]: (2) the *acc.* (R, IA, A), as

وَمَا زَالَ مَهْرِي مَزْجَرَ الْكَلْبِ مِنْهُمْ

لَدُنْ غَدُوَّةٌ حَتَّى دُنْتُ لَغُرُوبِ

(IA, A), by Abū Sufyān [Ṣakhr (AGh)] Ibn Ḥarb (SR) alKuraṣhī alUmawī (AGh), *And my colt ceased not to be as far from them as the rated dog* [64], *from morning until it* (i. e. *the sun*) *was near to setting* (J): (a) ^{أَ}لَدُنْ is then cut off from prothesis in letter and sense [above] (A); while ^{أَ}غَدُوَّةٌ is anomalously governed in the *acc.* (IM, R) by it (IM) as a *sp.* (IA, A), which IM prefers

(IA), or by assimilation to the [direct (Sn)] *obj.* (A), the reason being that ^ألَئِنْ is frequently used with ^أغَدُوَّةٌ, contrary to the rest of the *advs.*, like ^أبَكْرَةً and ^أعَشِيَّةً, and that, the ^أ of ^ألَئِنْ being pronounced with Damm, Fath, and Kasr, as above shown in its *dial. vars.*, and moreover its ^أ being sometimes elided, the vowels of the ^أ resemble the vowels of inflection in respect of their changeability, and the ^أ resembles the Tanwīn in respect of its suppressibility, so that ^ألَئِنْ ^أغَدُوَّةٌ becomes like ^ألَئِنْ ^أغَدُوَّةٌ [or ^ألَئِنْ ^أغَدُوَّةٌ] in letter, and therefore ^أغَدُوَّةٌ is governed in the *acc.* by assimilation to the *sp.* in ^ألَئِنْ ^أغَدُوَّةٌ [85] or to the *obj.* in ^ألَئِنْ ^أغَدُوَّةٌ [343] (R): (b) some say that ^أغَدُوَّةٌ is *pred.* of ^أكَانَ suppressed [with its *sub.* (A)], i. e. ^أكَانَتْ ^أالسَّاعَةُ ^أغَدُوَّةً since (the hour was) morning; [and, according to this construction, ^ألَئِنْ is *pre.* to the *prop.* (Sn)]: (c) if you couple to ^أغَدُوَّةٌ [after ^ألَئِنْ (IA)], the coupled may be in the *gen.* from observance of the general rule, or *acc.* from observance of the letter: Akh mentions that (IA, A), but IM deems the *acc.* improbable (A), because another *n.* than ^أغَدُوَّةٌ would then be governed in the *acc.* after ^ألَئِنْ [below] (Sn): (d) ^أغَدُوَّةٌ after ^ألَئِنْ is always pronounced with Tanwīn, even if it be *det.* [8], either by assimilation to the *sp.*,

so that it is i. q. ^أعِنْدِ مِنْ ^أعِنْدِ ; whereas ^ألَدَى is i. q. ^أعِنْدِ R). ^ألَدَى is like ^أعِنْدِ unrestrictedly, except that (1) it cannot be governed in the *gen.* [by the *p.* (Sn)], contrary to ^أعِنْدِ : (2) ^أعِنْدِ is more versatile than it in two ways, vid. that (a) ^أعِنْدِ is an *adv.* for concrete *ns.* and abstract ones, as ^أهَذَا الْقَوْلُ عِنْدِي صَوَابٌ *This saying in my opinion is correct* ; whereas that is impossible with ^ألَدَى : so says ISh: (b) you say ^أعِنْدِي مَالٌ [115], even if it be *absent* from you; but not ^ألَدَى مَالٌ, except when it is *present* : so say H, AHA, and ISh (A). It is [said to be] *uninfl.* upon quiescence (IY) : but there is no proof of its uninflectedness (R) ; and A's saying that it is "like ^أعِنْدِ unrestrictedly" implies that it is *infl.* (Sn). Its ^أ is [treated like the ^أ of ^أأَلَى and ^أعَلَى, being preserved with the explicit *n.*, and (R)] converted into ^أي with the *pron.* in the *dial.* of most [129] (R, BS); but S transmits on the authority of Khl from a people of the Arabs ^ألَدَاك , ^أأَلَاك , and ^أعَلَاك , as

طَارُوا عَلَيْهِمْ فَطَرَّ عَلَيْهِمُ * وَاصْدُدْ بِمِثْنَى حَقْبٍ حَقَوَاهَا

(R), by Abu-nNajm, *They have fled upon them, then flee thou upon her: and bind her two flanks tight with a double hind-girth* (FA).

§ 206. ^{أَلَّا} is a *n.* denoting *time present*, (1) in whole, as II. 66. [149]; (2) in part, as ^{فَمَنْ يَسْتَمِعِ} ^{أَلَّا} LXXII. 9. *For whoso listeneth now* (Sh), i. e. *at the time of the revelation of the text, and afterwards to the end of time* (MAd). It is an *adv. of time*, *uninfl.* upon Fatḥ [201] (IY, IA). Some hold that the ^{أَلْ} prefixed to it denotes *determination of presence* [599], because ^{أَلَّا} means *At this time*; but some, among whom is IM, hold that it is *red.*, and that ^{أَلَّا} is *uninfl.* because it implies the sense of the *p.* [159], vid. the ^ل of *presence* (IA). What I think is that ^{أَلَّا} is made *det.* by the ^ل expressed in it, which is inseparable from it, because the *det.* is always meant by it: and that it is *uninfl.* because of its vagueness [171] and applicability to every *time* when it is *present*, but not when it is *past*; and because the *p.* of determination is inseparable from it, so that it follows the course of ^{الَّذِي} [176] (IY). It is sometimes *infl.*, as in the saying [of Abū Ṣakhr alHudhalī (SM)]

لَسَلِمَىٰ بِذَاتِ الْبَيْتِ دَارُ عَرْفَتِهَا
 وَآخِرَىٰ بِذَاتِ الْجَيْشِ آيَاتُهَا سَطَرُ
 كَانَهُمَا مِلَانٍ لَمْ يَتَغَيَّرَا
 وَقَدْ مَرَّ لِلدَّارَيْنِ مِنْ بَعْدِنَا عَصْرُ

Salma had an abode at Dhāt AlBain that I knew, and another at Dhāt AlJaish, whose marks are erased like a line; as though they [the two places, masc. because each is a مَوْضِعٌ] had not been different from now, when an age has passed for the two abodes after our time, orig. مِنَ الْآنِ [660] (Sh). In II. 66. الْآنَ is read (B); and sometimes لَانَ is said (R). As for امْسِ, [when it means a specified (Sh, Fk) day (MAd), vid. the day before your day (Sh, YS), and is not pre., nor synarthrous, nor a{du. or (MAd)} broken pl., nor a dim. (Fk, MAd),] (1) according to the Hījāzīs, it is uninfl. (M, R, Sh, Fk) upon Kasr [201] (M, Sh, Fk), unrestrictedly (Sh, Fk), i. e. in the nom., acc., and gen., with and without Tanwīn (YS), as

مَنْعَ الْبَقَاءِ تَقْلِبُ الشَّمْسِ * وَطُلُوعَهَا مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا تَمْسِي

وَطُلُوعَهَا حُمْرًا صَافِيَةً * وَغُرُوبَهَا صَفْرًا كَالْزُرِّ

تَجْرِي عَلَى كِبْدِ السَّمَاءِ كَمَا * يَجْرِي حِمَامُ الْمَوْتِ فِي النَّفْسِ

الْيَوْمَ أَعْلَمَ مَا يَجِيءُ بِهِ * وَمَضَى بِفَضْلِ قَضَائِهِ امْسِ

(Sh) by Rauh Ibn Zimbā' [alJudhāmi (ID, Is)], *The changing of the sun has forbidden remaining (in the world), and its rising from where it enters not upon the evening, and its rising red, clear, and its setting yellow like saffron. It runs its course upon the middle of the sky, as the doom of death runs its course in the living*

being. To-day I know what it (*i. e. to-day*) brings, and yesterday has passed by the grace of His (*i. e. the Lord's*) decree (Jsh): (a) according to the GG (Fk), it is *uninfl.* because of its implying [the sense of (Fk)] the determinative ج [159] (IY, R, Fk), and becoming *det.* thereby [IY]: for, every day anterior to a day being its yesterday, أمس^{٨٤} is *orig. indet.*; and afterwards, when the yesterday of the speaker's day is meant, the determinative ج denoting knowledge is prefixed to it; but is then suppressed and supplied, because the mind of every one that bears أمس^{٨٤} free from prothesis immediately flies to the yesterday of the speaker's day, so that it becomes *det.*, as لقيته أمس^{٨٤ ٥٥ ٨٤} بالحدث^{٨٤ ٨٤} I met him on the most recent yesterday (R): (b) it is *uninfl.* upon a vowel in order that it may be known to be *orig. infl.* [159] (Fk); and [tho سي (IY)] is pronounced with Kasr, [according to rule (Fk)], because of the concurrence of 2 quiescents [664] (IY, Fk): (c) رأيت^{٨٤ ٥٥ ٨٤} أمس^{٨٤} I saw him yesterday has been heard, but is anomalous (KF): (2) according to [most of (Sh, Fk)] Banū Tamīm, [as S transmits from them (R),] it is (a) *infl.* as a diptote in the nom. [exclusively (Sh, Fk), as

[the combination of (IY)] deviation (IY, Fk) from ^{أَمْسَى} *الأمسى* (Fk) with determination (IY), [i. e.] with the quality of proper name [18] (Fk): (b) the difference between deviation [from the *p.* (IY)] and implication [of it (IY)] is that with deviation the *p.* may be expressed, but not with implication (IY, YS), for which reason what deviates is *infl.*, and what implies is *uninfl.*; and thereby is known the secret of the inflectedness of ^{سَحَرٌ} [18] and the uninflectedness of ^{أَمْسَى} *أمسى* according the Hijāzīs: but some say that deviation is alteration of the *lit.* form of the word while its sense remains, and that implication is the use of it in its original sense with another sense super-added (YS): (c) Z and many of the GG say that ^{أَمْسَى} *أمسى* is *infl.* according to the Banū Tamīm unrestrictedly, i. e. in all states, being perhaps misled by the verse ^{لَقَدْ رَأَيْتَ النَّعْمَ} [above]; whereas S restricts this saying by the words “some of the Banū Tamīm” and “after ^{مُدَّ}” (R): (d) Zji is mistaken in asserting upon the authority of this verse, that, according to some of the Arabs, ^{أَمْسَى} *أمسى* is *uninfl.* upon Fath (R, Sh): (4) according to some of the Arabs, as some relate, it [is held to be *indet.*, and (IY)] is *infl.* as a triptote (IY, R, YS), unrestrictedly (YS), like ^{عُدَّ} (R), as ^{مَضَى أَمْسَى بِمَا فِيهِ} *مَضَى أَمْسَى بِمَا فِيهِ* Yesterday has passed with what was in it (IY); but this

is strange (IY, R). S says that, if you name a man ^{أَمْسَى} according to the *dial.* of AlHijāz, you make it triptote, like غَاتِي [200] when used as a name, because every *uninfl.* single term used as a name for a person must be *infl.* as a triptote [191]: and, according to the *dial.* of [most of] the Banū Tamīm also, you make it triptote in the [3] cases, because it must be made triptote in the *acc.* and *gen.*, since it is *uninfl.* upon Kasr according to them ; and, when you make it triptote in the two cases, you must do so in the *nom.* also, since there is no *n.* in the language triptote in the *acc.* and *gen.* and diptote in the *nom.* (R). But, when one of the preceding conditions is wanting (Fk), [i. e.] when ^{أَمْسَى} (1) is *indet.* (R), [which occurs] when it means *some day or other of the past days* (Sh), as ^{أَمْسَى} كُلُّ غَدٍ يَصِيرُ أَمْسًا *Every to-morrow will become a yesterday* (R), or (2) is *pre.*, [as ^{أَمْسَنَا} مَضَى أَمْسَنَا *Our yesterday has passed* (R, MAd),] or (3) is *synarthrous*, [as X. 25. (532) (Sh),] or (4) is a [*du.* or (R, MAd) broken (Sh)] *pl.* (R, Sh), as [^{أَمْسَانِي} مَضَى أَمْسَانِي *Two yesterdays have passed* and (MAd)]

مَرَّتْ بَنَا أَوَّلَ مِّنْ أَمْسٍ * تَمِيسُ فِينَا مِيسَةً الْعُرُوسِ

(Sh) *She passed by us before days gone by, swaying in her walk with the swaying walk of the bride* (MAd), it is *infl.* [as a triptote (Fk)] by common consent (R, Sh,

Fk), because of the removal of the cause of uninflectedness, vid. the supply of the ج (R): (a) the synarthrous ^{أس}امسى is sometimes *uninfl.* (R, YS), perhaps because the ج is construed to be *red.* (R); and, in the verse [of Nuṣaib (MAd)]

فَانِي رَقِيتُ الْيَوْمَ وَالْأَمْسِ قَبْلَهُ
بِبَابِكَ حَتَّى كَابَتِ الشَّمْسُ تَغْرِبُ

[*And verily I have stood to-day and yesterday before it at thy door until the sun was near to setting* (MAd)],

^{أس}امسى is related with [Fath as being an *infl. adv.*, and (Sh)] Kasr as being *uninfl.* (Sh, YS): (b) the cause of its inflection in the *du.* and *pl.* is that the ج is supplied only because the mind immediately flies to one of the genus on account of its notoriety among its likes; whereas, when ^{أس}امسى is dualized or pluralized, that specified one no longer remains (R): (c) according to AH (YS), ^{أس}امسى is declared by S [and others (YS)] to have no *dim.* [292] (R, Sh, YS), like غَدٌ (R, YS); but it is said by Mb, [F, H, and IM (Sh), as likewise by IB (YS),] to have a *dim.* (Sh, YS), in which case it is *infl.*, according to all, as when it is a broken *pl.* (Sh). If, however, [the anarthrous (Fk)] ^{أس}امسى [that means a *specified* (Fk) day] be used as an *adv.*, it is *uninfl.* by common consent (Fk, MAd): so in the Audāḥ (Fk), which here follows IB

(YS). ^{قَطَا} [is an *adv.*, which (ML)] denotes *totality of past time*; [and is always used in the sense of ^{أَبَدًا} *ever*, because it is derived from ^{أَقَطَا}, which means *cutting* (187), as you say ^{لَا أَفْعَلُهَا أَبَتَةً} *I shall decidedly not do it*, except that ^{قَطَا} is *uninfl.*, contrary to ^{أَبَتَةً} (R)]. It is (1) peculiar to negation (M, R, ML), as ^{مَا فَعَلْتُهُ قَطَا} *I have not ever done it* (IY, ML): (2) sometimes used without negation (R, DM), (a) in letter and sense, as ^{كَذَبْتُ أَرَاهُ قَطَا} *I used to see him continually or always*, i. e. ^{دَائِمًا} (R), whence the saying of one of the Companions ^{قَصَرْنَا إِصْلَاحًا} *We shortened prayer in journeying with the Apostle* (God bless him, and give him peace!) in most of our ever being, i. e. ^{أَكْثَرَ وُجُودِنَا فِيمَا مَضَى} *in most of our existence in the past* (DM); (b) in letter but not sense, as ^{هَلْ رَأَيْتَ النَّذْبَ قَطَا} [144] (R). It is *uninfl.* (R, ML), because, as is said, some of its *dial. vars.* are constituted like *ps.* [159], as will be seen; but rather because it always implies [the sense of the *p.*, *vid.*] the *ل* of *totality* [599], since it includes the *whole of the past* (R); [or] because it implies the sense of ^{مَنْذَرٌ} [510] and ^{إِلَى} [500], since the sense is [*I have not done it*] *since I was created unil now* (ML). It is *uninfl.* [upon a vowel, in order

that two quiescents may not meet together: and (ML)] upon Damm (IY, R, ML), by assimilation to the finals (ML), like قَبْلُ and بَعْدُ [201] (IY); and sometimes upon Kasr, according to rule [664] (ML). قَطَا is the best known of its *dial. vars.* (R, ML); and قَطَا, قَطَا, [قَطَا (IY, R), and قَطَا (R, ML)] occur (M, R, ML). عَوْضُ [or عَوْضُ (M), *orig. & n.* denoting {time and (R)} *period* (IY, R), is an *adv.*, which (ML)] denotes *totality of future time* (M, R, ML), *i. q.* اَبَدًا (R, ML); but is sometimes used to denote *bare time*, not *i. q.* اَبَدًا, in which case it is *infl.*, as

وَلَوْلَا نَبْلُ عَوْضٍ فِي خَضَمَاتِي وَأَوْصَالِي
لَطَاعَنْتُ صُدُورَ الْخَيْلِ طَاعِنًا لَيْسَ بِالْأَلَايِ

[by AlFind azZimmānī, *And, but for a shooting of time in the thick parts of my forearms and my joints, I should have speared the breasts of the horsemen with a spearing not the one falling short* (T)] and أَفْعَلُ ذَلِكَ مِنْ نَدَى عَوْضٍ, *i. e.* *I will do that in future* (R). It is (1) peculiar to negation (M, R, ML), and mostly used with the oath (IY, R), as رَضِيعَى لِبَانِ الْخِ [600] (M, R): (2) sometimes used with affirmation, and in the sense of the *past*, as

وَلَوْلَا دِفَاعِي عَنْ عَفَاقٍ وَمُشْهَدِي
هَوَتْ بِعَفَاقٍ عَوْضٍ عَنْقَاءُ مَغْرِبٍ

And, but for my defending 'Ifāk and mine awe-inspiring aspect, a calamity would have destroyed 'Ifāk before; though here it is negated in sense, because it is in the correl. of لَوْلَا [574] (R). If pre., it is infl., as لَا أَفْعَلُهُ لا انفعلته [574] (R). If pre., it is infl., as عَوْضُ الْعَائِضِينَ I will not do it ever [below] (IY, ML), i. e. دَهْرٌ الدَّاهِرِينَ (IY); and, if not pre., it is uninfl. (ML). It is uninfl., [because it implies the sense of the 1 and 2 (T)]: (1) upon Damm, [transmitted by the KK (T), because it is cut off from prothesis (IY, R), like قَبْلُ (IY, R, ML) and بَعْدُ (201) (IY, R), as is proved by its being infl. with the post., as عَوْضُ الْعَائِضِينَ (above), i. e. so long as a period of time remains (R)]; (2) upon Fath (T, IY, R, ML), for the sake of lightness (IY), like أَيْنَ [below] (ML); (3) upon Kasr (R, ML), like أَمْسَى [above]. لَمَّا is peculiar to the pret.; and requires two props., [the purport of (DM)] the 2nd of which exists upon the existence [of the purport (DM)] of the 1st. It is said to be a p. denoting existence [of its correl. (DM)] because of existence [of its prot. (DM)]; or, says one of them, [vid. S (DM),] a p. denoting necessity [of the 2nd (DM)] because of necessity (ML) of the 1st

(DM). According to [IS, however, who is followed by (ML)] F (R, ML), IJ, and many (ML), it is [a *n.* used, like ^{كَلِمًا}, in the same way as a *cond.* word (204) (R).] an *adv.* (IY, R, ML) of *time* (IY), i. q. ^{حِينَ} (IY, ML), the meaning of which is *vague time* (IY); or, says IM (ML), i. q. ^{أَن} (R, ML), which is good, because it is peculiar to the *pret.* and to prefixion to the *prop.* (ML), like ^{أَن} (DM): and it is *uninfl.*, because of its vagueness and need of a *prop.* after it, like ^{أَن} and ^{أَن} [159, 201] (IY). IKh refutes the assertors of its nominality by the allowability of ^{لَمَّا أَكْرَمْتَنِي أَمْسِي أَكْرَمْتُكَ الْيَوْمَ} *Since thou honoredst me yesterday, I honored thee to-day*, [upon the ground that it is a *p.* of dependence, not adverbial (DM),] because, when it is construed to be an *adv.*, its *op.* is the *correl.*, [so that the sense resolves itself into *I honored thee to-day at the time when thou honoredst me yesterday* (DM),] whereas the honoring occurring *to-day* was not in *yesterday*; but the reply is that this is like V. 116. [419], i. e. *If (it prove that) I have said it*, and similarly here, i. e. *When (it proved) to-day (that) thou honoredst me yesterday, I honored thee* (ML). It is followed by a [v. (R)] *pret.* (IY, R) in letter and sense or by ^{لَمْ يَفْعَلْ} (R). And its *correl.* is (1) a *pret. v.*, [by common consent, as ^{فَلَمَّا نَجَّيْنَاهُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ أَعْرَضْتُمْ} XVII. 69. *And, when He hath brought you safe to land,* ^{وَعَرَضْتُمْ}

turn aside (ML): (2) a nominal *prop.* conjoined with (a) the اِذَا denoting *suddenness of occurrence*, [also by common consent (DM), as فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ إِلَى الْبَرِّ إِذَا هُمْ يُشْرِكُونَ XXIX. 65. *And, when He hath brought them safe to land, lo, they worship other gods!* (ML), whence IV. 79. (204) (R)]; (b) the ف, [according to IM, as فَلَمَّا نَجَّاهُمْ XXXI. 31. *And, when He hath brought them safe to land, then of them is a hesitater* (ML)]; (3) an aor. (R, ML) i. q. the *pret.* (DM), according to IU, as فَلَمَّا ذَهَبَ عَنْ إِبْرَاهِيمَ الرَّوْعُ وَجَاءَتْهُ الْبَشَرُ XI. 57. *And, when the dread had departed from Abraham, and the glad tidings had come unto him, he disputed with the messengers of Us*, which is renderable by جَادَلْنَا (ML): (4) seldom a *pret.* conjoined with the ف (R). A difficult *ex.* of this لَمَّا is the saying of the poet

أَقُولُ لِعَبْدِ اللَّهِ لَمَّا سَقَاؤُنَا
وَنَحْنُ بِوَادِي عَيْدِ شَمْسٍ وَهَاشِمٍ

[*I say, i. e. said, to 'Abd Allāh, when our bucket fell, while we were in the valley of 'Abd Shams, Look, and watch it (Jsh)*]; for, it is said, "where are its two *vs.*?" but the reply is that سَقَاؤُنَا is *ag.* of a suppressed *v.* expounded by وَهَاشِمٍ, [which is a *v.* (DM)] i. q. سَقَطَ, [not

part of a personal proper name, and ought to be written with the *ي*, but is written with the *ا* for the sake of the puzzle (DM)]; and that the *correl.* is suppressed, constructively *قُلْتُ*, as is proved by *أَقُولُ*; while *شِم* is an *imp.* from *شَمْتُ الْبَرْقِ* *I looked at* [and *watched* (Jsh)] *the lightning*; and the meaning is *When our bucket fell* [into the well (DM)], *I said to 'Abd Allāh, Look at it* (ML). *لَهُ* in their saying *أَبُوكَ لَهُ*, i. e. *لِلَّهِ أَبُوكَ*, is akin to the *uninfl. advs.*, because it is *orig.* a *prep.* and *gen.*, the predicament of which is the same as that of *advs.* [498]. The *prep.* *ل* is suppressed from frequency of usage, and the determinative *ل* supplied, so that *لَهُ أَبُوكَ* remains, as *لَهُ أَبْنُ عَمِّكَ الْخ* [508]; and therefore it is *uninfl.*, because it implies [the sense of] the *p.* [159]: and afterwards the *ع* and *ل* [of *لَهُ orig. لِيهِ*] are transposed, the *ح* being made quiescent because of its occurrence in the place of the quiescent *ا*, and the *ا* being restored to its *o. f.* as a *ي* because of the quiescence of the *ع*, according to one of S's two opinions upon *إِلَهُ*, vid. that it is from *لَهُ* *He was hidden or veiled*, *يَلِيهِ*; while the *ي* is then pronounced with Fath, because of the lightness of Fath upon the *ي*; and sometimes the *ي* is elided, so that *لَهُ أَبُوكَ* is said. *مَعَ* [115], as S appears to say, is *uninfl.*: and is held to be so because it

is constituted like *ps.* [159]; or because it resembles the *p.* in the smallness of its plasticity, since it is always in the *acc.*: but it should rather be decided to be *infl.*, because of the affixion of the Tanwīn in such as كُنَّا مَعًا *We were together*; and of the sign of the *gen.* in such as خَرَجْتُ مِنْ عِنْدِهِ *I went forth from beside him*, i. e. مِنْ عِنْدِهِ, although the prefixion of مِنْ to it is anomalous. The ل in مَعًا, according to Khl, is a substitute for the 'Tanwīn [640], since, according to him, مَع has no ل in the *o. f.*; but, according to Y and Akh, which is the truth, it is like the ل of فَتَى, a substitute for the ل [719]; so that مَع, according to them, is the reverse of [the *pre. n.* in] أَخُوكَ [16], it ل being restored in the aprothetic state, and elided in prothesis, because its place is supplied by the *post. (R).* أَيْنَ is [an *adv.* of place (IY),] (1) *interrog.* [581], as أَيْنَ كُنْتَ *Where wast thou?*; (2) *cond.* [419] (M, R), as

أَيْنَ تَصْرِفُ بِهَا الْغَدَاةَ تَجِدُنَا * نَصْرِفُ الْغَيْسَ نَحْوَهَا لِلتَّلَافِي

Wherever thou turnest with her in the early morning thou wilt find us turn the pale yellow camels towards her for meeting (IY). It is *uninfl.* [159] upon a vowel because of the [combination of (IY)] two quiescents, and upon Fath because of the heaviness of [Damm or (R)]

Kasr [664] after the ^ي (IY, R). ^{مَتَى} is [a *n.* (ML),] (1) *interrog.*, [as ^{مَتَى نَصْرُ اللَّهِ} II. 210. *When will the help of God be?* (ML)]; (2) *cond.* (M, R, ML), as ^{إِنَّا أَبْنِي} [149] (IY, ML): and in both cases denotes *time* (R). ^{مَتَى} is also a *p.* [513], or a *n. syn.* with ^{وَسَطًا}, as in ^{وَضَعْتُهُ مَتَى كُمِي} *I put it in, or in the middle of, my sleeve*, [transmitted by AZ (R),] where it is *i. q.* ^{فِي}, [says ISd (ML),] or ^{وَسَطًا} [say others (ML)]; and similarly in ^{شَرِبْنِي بِمَاءِ الْبَحْرِ الْخ} [503, 513], where it is *i. q.* ^{مِنْ}, [say some (ML),] or ^{وَسَطًا} (R, ML), says ISd (ML). It is *uninfl.* [159] upon quiescence (IY). The *red.* ^{مَا} [565] is attached to [the *cond.* (IY)] ^{مَتَى} and ^{أَيُّ}, [as IV. 80. (419, 565, 181) and

^{مَتَى مَا يَرِ النَّاسُ الْغَنَى وَجَارُهُ * فَقِيرٌ يَقُولُوا عَاجِزٌ وَحَلِيدٌ}
*Whenever men see the rich, while his neighbour is poor, they say "Helpless and powerful" (IY)]; and augments them in vagueness. The distinction between ^{مَتَى} and ^{إِذَا} [204] is that ^{مَتَى} denotes *vague time*, and ^{إِذَا} ^ع [specified (M), *vid. coming, time*, for which reason ^{مَتَى} is *cond.*, and ^{إِذَا} is not; for, if ^{إِن} *If* were put in the place of ^{إِذَا} in LXXXIV. 1. [23], it would not be good,*

because what is certain to come to pass would be made doubtful [588] (IY). ^{اَيَّانَ} is [a vague *adv.* of time (IY),] (1) i. q. the *interrog.* ^{مَتَى} (M, R), except that (a) ^{مَتَى} is more frequently used; (b) ^{اَيَّانَ} is peculiar to great [and solemn (IY)] matters, as ^{يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ السَّاعَةِ} ^{اَيَّانَ} ^{مُرْسَاهَا} VII. 186 *They ask thee about the resurrection, when its coming to pass will be* (IY, R) and LI. 12. [445], whereas ^{اَيَّانَ} ^{نَعْتُ} is not said; (c) ^{اَيَّانَ} is peculiar to the *future*, contrary to ^{مَتَى}, which is used in the *past* and *future*: (2) *cond.* [419], allowed by some of the moderns (R). It is *uninfl.* because of its implying [the sense of] the *interrog.* Hamza: and its final is vocalized because of the concurrence of two quiescents; and pronounced with Fatḥ by alliteration to the *l* or Fatḥa before it, as in ^{شَتَّانَ} [196] (IY). According to LJ (K on VII. 186., R), ^{اَيَّانَ} is derived from ^{اَيَّ} [184] (K, B, R), being ^{فُعْلَانِ} from it (K), because its sense is ^{اَيَّ} ^{وَقْتُ} *At what time?* (K, B); not from ^{اَيَّ}, because [it denotes *time*, while (K)] ^{اَيَّ} denotes *place* (K, R); and because ^{فُعْلَانِ} is rare, and ^{فُعْلَانِ} frequent, among *ns.*: so that, if used as a name, it would be diptote [18]. Kasr of its Hamza is the *dial.* of Sulaim (R), and AsSulamī reads ^{اَيَّانَ} (K); and An says that Kasr of its *ن* is a *dial.*

var. (R). As for the parsing of *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* and the like [218], (1) if a *prep.* or *pre. n.* be prefixed to them, they are in the place of the *gen.*, as LXXVIII. 1. [181], ^{صَبِيحَةَ} ^{أَيَّ} ^{يَوْمٍ} ^{سَفَرِكَ} *On the morning of what day will thy journey be?* [111], and ^{غَلَامٌ} ^{مِنْ} ^{جَاؤَكَ} *Whose young man came to thee?*: [and therefore the saying that *cond.* and *interrog. ns.* are not governed by what precedes them holds good only if what precedes them be not a *prep.* or *pre. n.*; whereas, if it be so, they are governed by it (DM)]: (2) if not, then, (a) if they be applied to *time*, as ^{وَمَا} ^{يَشْعُرُونَ} ^{أَيَّانَ} ^{يَبْعَثُونَ} XVI. 21. 22. *Nor know they when they shall be raised, or place, as* ^{فَإِنِ} ^{تَذْهَبُونَ} LXXXI. 26. *Then where are ye going?, or accident, as* XXVI. 228. [445], they are governed in the *acc.* as adverbial or unrestricted *objs.*: (b) if not, then, (a) if they be followed by an *indet. n.*, as ^{مَنْ} ^{أَبُ} ^{لَكَ} *Who is a father to thee?*, they are *inchs.*; and, if by a *det. n.*, as ^{مَنْ} ^{زَيْدٌ} *Who is Zaid?*, they are *entuncs.* or *inchs.* according to different opinions [24]: but these two sorts do not occur among *cond. ns.*, [because they are followed only by *vs.* (DM)]: (b) if not, then, if they be followed by an *intrans. v.*, they are *inchs.*, as ^{مَنْ} ^{قَامَ} *Who stood?* and ^{مَنْ} ^{يَقُمُ} ^{أَقَمَ} ^{مَعَهُ} *Whoever stands, I will stand with him*; and, if they be followed by a *trans. v.* that befalls [44] them, they are direct *objs.*, as

Every one of mankind is such that, if he stands, I will stand with him [27]: but the correct opinion is the 1st; while the sense depends upon the *correl.* only as respects contingency, not as respects enunciativity. The *correl.*

of the *cond. n.* governed in the *nom.* by inchoation needs a *cop.*, which is only a *pron.*, (1) mentioned, as قَمْنٌ

يَكْفُرُ بَعْدَ مِنْكُمْ فَاتَىٰ أَعَذِبُهُ عَذَابًا V. 115. *Then whosoever of you disbelieveth afterwards, verily I will chastise him*

with a chastisement; (2) supplied, or replaced by a substitute, as قَمْنٌ قَرَضَ فِيهِنَّ الْحَمَّ فَلَا رَفْثَ وَلَا فَسُوقَ وَلَا

جِدَالَ فِي الْحَمِّ II. 193. *Then, whoso bindeth himself to undertake the pilgrimage in them, there shall be no*

lewd conversation and no transgression and no wrangling proceeding (from him) in the pilgrimage, or no wrang-

ling in his pilgrimage, i. e. مِنْهُ or orig. فِي حَجَّةٍ [599]:

and, as for the texts بَلَىٰ مَنْ أَوْفَىٰ بِعَهْدِهِ وَاتَّقَىٰ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِينَ

III. 70. *Yea, whoso fulfilleth his covenant, and is pious, (God will love him): for verily God loveth*

the pious and وَمَنْ يَقُولِ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالتَّائِبِينَ آمَنُوا فَإِنَّ

V. 61. *And whoso taketh God*

and His Apostle and them that have believed as friends, (shall overcome): for verily the host of God, they are the

overcomers and the verse [of AlKutāmi (DM)]

فَمَنْ تَكُنِ الْحَضَارَةُ اعْجَبْتَهُ * فَالْيَ رِجَالِ بَادِيَةِ تَرَانَا

[Then whoso is such that townsfolk do please him, (we are not of his quality): then what men of a desert dost thou deem us to be? (DM)], the *correl.* in them is suppressed, i. e. ^{يُحِبُّهُ} ^{اللَّهُ} ^{يُحِبُّهُ} [in the *apoc.* (DM)], ^{يُغْلِبُ}, and ^{فَلَسْنَا} ^{عَلَى} ^{صِفَتِهِ}. The *interrog.* or *cond. reg.* of the *v.* or its like must precede [the *op.* (DM)], as XL. 81. [above], XXVI. 228. [445], and XXVIII. 28. [184]; and for this reason the *pron.* of the case is supplied in ^{أَنْ} ^{مَنْ} [204] and ^{أَنْ} ^{مَنْ} [204] and every *adv.* containing the sense of *condition* is its *prot.*, as most say; and may not be its *apod.*, as some say, just as the *op.* may not be the *apod.* in the case of non-adverbial [*cond.*] *ns.*, since you do not say ^{أَيْهَمُ} ^{أَيْهَمُ} ^{أَيْهَمُ} with ^{أَيْهَمُ} ^{أَيْهَمُ} ^{أَيْهَمُ} in the *acc.* (R).

§ 207. ^{كَيْفَ} is a *n.* (IY, ML), not a *p.* or *v.* (IY), because (1) the *prep.* is prefixed to it without paraphrase [20, 468] in their saying ^{عَلَى} ^{كَيْفَ} ^{تَبِيعُ} ^{الْأَحْمَرَيْنِ} [In what state dost thou sell the two red things, i. e. wine and meat? (DM)]: (2) the genuine *n.* is made a *subst.* for it [without paraphrase (DM)], as ^{كَيْفَ} ^{أَنْتَ} ^{أَصْغِيحُ} ^{أَمْ} [below]: (3) in such as ^{كَيْفَ} ^{كُنْتُ} ^{سَقِيمٌ} How was

thou? it is made a *pred.*, which excludes the *p.* [497] and is contiguous to the *v.*, which excludes the *v.* [593] (ML). It is treated as an *adv.* (M, R) by many, who render it by the *prep.* (IY); because it is i. q. ^{عَلَى} ^{أَيِّ} ^{حَالٍ} *In* what state?, and the *prep.* and *adv.* are akin. That ^{كَيْفَ} *How* is an *adv.* is the opinion of Akh (R): but [according to S (R)] it is [correctly (IY)] a [plain (IY)] *n.*, [not an *adv.*, though it conveys the sense of ^{عَلَى} ^{أَيِّ} ^{حَالٍ} (IY),] because the *n.* occurs as a *subst.* for it, as ^{كَيْفَ} ^{أَنْتَ} *How art thou?* (IY); [and as a reply to it, as ^{أَصِحِّمُ} ^{أَمْ} ^{سَقِيمٌ} *Well or ill?* [and as a reply to it, as ^{صَحِّمُ} *Well* or ^{سَقِيمُ} *Ill* in reply to ^{كَيْفَ} ^{أَنْتَ} *How art thou?* (IY)]; whereas, if it were an *adv.*, the *adv.* would occur as a *subst.* for it (IY, R), and as a reply to it (IY); though Akh may say that the *prep.* and *gen.* may be made a *subst.* for it, as ^{كَيْفَ} ^{زَيْدٌ} *How is Zaid,* in the state of health, or in the state of sickness?, [and similarly with the reply]. Thus ^{كَيْفَ}, according to S, is renderable by ^{عَلَى} ^{أَيِّ} ^{حَالٍ} *In what state* [art thou] *existing?*; but, according to Akh, by ^{عَلَى} ^{أَيِّ} ^{حَالٍ} *In what state?*, ^{حَاصِلٌ}, according to him, being supplied [26, 498] (R). It is used in two ways, (1) as a *cond.*, in which case it requires two *vs.* agreeing in letter and sense, and not

apocopated, [whether ^{مَا} be prefixed to them or not according to the BB (DM),] as ^{كَيْفَ تَصْنَعُ أَصْنَعُ} *How-
ever thou dost, I will do*; while ^{كَيْفَ تَجْلِسُ أَذْهَبُ} is not allowable by common consent [of the BB and KK (DM)]; nor ^{كَيْفَ تَجْلِسُ أَجْلِسُ} according to the BB, except Ktb, [who agrees with the KK (DM),] because ^{كَيْفَ} differs from the *cond.* instruments [419] in that its *correl.* must agree with its *prot.*, as above stated: but some say that this [apocopation of the two *vs.* by it (DM)] is allowable unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether it be conjoined with ^{مَا} or not (DM),] which is the opinion of Ktb and the KK; or upon condition of its being conjoined with ^{مَا}, [which opinion is followed by the author of the Aj, since he says “ { The apocopatives are ^{لَمْ},..... (Aj), } and ^{كَيْفَمَا} ” (DM)]: (a) they say that ^{يُنْفِقُ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ} V. 69. *He dispenseth His bounty howsoever He willeth* and ^{الَّذِي يَصْرِفُكُمْ فِي الْأَرْحَامِ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ} III. 4. *He that fashioneth you in the wombs howsoever He willeth* are instances of its occurrence as *cond.*, its *correl.* being suppressed because indicated by what precedes it, [i. e. ^{كَيْفَ يَصْرِفُكُمْ} and ^{كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ} ^{يُنْفِقُ} (DM)]; but this is dubious according to their unrestricted declaration that its *correl.* must resemble its *prot.*, [whether the *correl.* be mentioned or suppressed (DM)]: (2) as an *interrog.*,

which is mostly the case, either real, as ^{كَيْفَ زَيْدٌ} [above]; or otherwise, as II. 26. [80], where it is used in the sense of *wonder*: (a) it [i. e. the *interrog.* (DM)] occurs (a) as an *enunc.* or *pred.* before what is not independent [of an *enunc.* real or annulled (DM)], as ^{كَيْفَ ظَنَنْتَ زَيْدًا} and ^{كَيْفَ كُنْتَ}; and hence ^{كَيْفَ اعْلَمْتَهُ فَرَسَكُ} *How thoughtest thou Zaid to be?* and ^{كَيْفَ اعْلَمْتَهُ فَرَسَكُ} *How madest thou him to know thy horse to be?*, because the 2nd *obj.* of ^{ظَنَى} and the 3rd of ^{اعْلَمَ} are *orig. enuncs.* [440, 434]: (b) as a *d. s.* before what is independent [of an *enunc.* (DM)], as ^{كَيْفَ جَاءَ زَيْدٌ} *How* [74], i. e. *In what state, came Zaid?*; and, in my opinion, as an unrestricted *obj.* also in this sort, whence ^{أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ فَعَلَ} *Alm tar kayfa fa'ala* LXXXIX. 5. *Hast thou not seen how, i. e. with what dealing, thy Lord dealt with 'Ad?*, since the sense is ^{أَيَّ فَعْلٍ فَعَلَ}, and similarly ^{كَيْفَ إِذَا جِئْنَا مِنْ كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ} IV. 45. *Then how (will they do) when We bring from every people a witness?*, its *op.* ^{يَصْنَعُونَ} being supplied between ^{كَيْفَ} and ^{إِذَا}: (b) ^{كَيْفَ} with what follows it in LXXXVIII. 17. ^{أَفَلَا يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَى الْآلِبِلِ كَيْفَ خُلِقَتْ} *What! then will they not look at the camels, how they have been created?* is a *subst.* of implication for ^{الْآلِبِلِ}, the

sense being ^{أَلَى} ^{الْأَبْلِ} ^{كَيْفِيَّةً} ^{خُلِقَهَا} *at the camels, the mode of their creation*; and similar are XXV. 47. [581] and ^{أَلَى} ^{اللَّهِ} ^{أَشْكُرُ} ^{أَنْ} [1], i. e. ^{تَعَذَّرَ} ^{التَّفَاقُّهُمَا} *the impossibility of their meeting together* (ML), ^{كَيْفَ} being expounded by ^{تَعَذَّرَ} as an indication that the interrogation here denotes *deeming improbable* (DM): (c) *preps.* are not prefixed to it, as they are to ^{أَيْنَ} when you say ^{مِنْ} ^{أَيْنَ} *From where?* and ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَلَى} *To where?*, because ^{أَيْنَ} is a question as to *places*, to which *preps.* are prefixed, as ^{مِنْ} ^{السُّوقِ} *From the market* and ^{أَلَى} ^{السُّوقِ} *To the market*; whereas ^{كَيْفَ} is a question as to *states*, to which *preps.* are not prefixed, for you do not say ^{أَمِنْ} ^{صَحِيحٍ} or ^{أَمِنْ} ^{سَقِيمٍ} (IY): but Ktb transmits from some of the Arabs ^{أَنْظُرْ} ^{أَلَى} ^{كَيْفَ} ^{يَصْنَعُ} *Look how he does* (M), and they say ^{أَعْلَى} ^{كَيْفَ} ^{تَبِيعَ} ^{الْأَحْمَرِيِّ} [above], which are anomalous: (d) its reply is only *indet.*, as ^{صَالِحٍ}, not ^{الصَّالِحِ}, in reply to ^{كَيْفَ} ^{زَيْدٍ} (IY). Many assert that ^{كَيْفَ} occurs as a copulative [*p.* (DM)]; and among them is IIM, who cites as an instance of it

أَذَا قَلَّ مَالُ الْمَرْءِ لَأَنْتَ قَنَاتُهُ

وَهَانَ عَلَى الْأَدْنَى فَكَيْفَ الْإِبَاعِدِ

(ML) *When the wealth of the man becomes small, his spear-shaft becomes soft, and he is lowered before the nearest kinsman, and the farthest ones, the ف being apparently red. (DM). It is uninfl. because it occurs in the place, and implies the sense, of the interrog. [159]; and the ف is mobilized to avoid the concurrence of quiescents, and pronounced with Fath because Kasra [664] is deemed heavy after the ي (IY). And كَى is said for كَيْف (IY, R, ML), like سَوْف for سَوْ [578] (IY, ML), as*

كَى تَجْنَحُونَ إِلَى سَلَمٍ وَمَا تُثْبِتُ
قَتْلَكُمْ وَلَطَى الْهَيْجَاءُ تَضْطَرُّمُ

(ML) *How incline ye to peace, when your slain have not been avenged, and the flame of war is blazing? (FA, Jsh): and, [according to An (R),] this is a dial. var.; but some say that the ف is elided [for alleviation (IY) by poetic license (R)]. اِنِّى is [an adv. of place (IY),] (1) interrog., [as اِنِّى لَكَ هَذَا III. 32. Whence hast thou this? (IY)]; (2) cond., as*

فَاَصْبَحْتُ اِنِّى تَاتَهَا تَشْتَجِرُ بِهَا
كَلَّا مَرَّ كَيْبُهَا تَحْتَ رَجْلِكَ شَاجِرُ

[by Labid (IY), *Then thou hast become such that, whencesoever thou comest to it (meaning calamity, which*

he compares to a *restive beast*), *thou art embarrassed with it: each of its two seats (before and behind) between thy two legs is unsteady* (AAz): and has [three senses, whether it be *interrog.* or *cond.*, vid. (R)] the sense of (1) ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ}, [except that it is used with ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ}, (a) expressed, as

مِنْ أَيْنَ عِشْرُونَ لَنَا مِنْ أَيْنَ

{*From where have we twenty (camels or sheep), from where? (Jsh)*}; (b) supplied (R),] as III. 32., [i. e.

^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} (R),] meaning ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} : (2) ^{كَيْفَ} (IY, R),

according to some (IY), as ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} V. 79.

Then behold how they are perverted (R), whence II. 223 [below] and

أَيْنَ وَمِنْ أَيْنَ أَبْكَ الطَّرَبُ * مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا صَبُوءَ وَلَا دَيْبُ

(IY), by AlKumait, *How, and whence, has mirth returned to thee, since there are no youthful folly and no*

scandals? (AAz): (3) ^{مَتَى}; while the text ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ} ^{أَيْنَ}

^{أَيْنَ} II. 223. *Then come to your husbandry [1] whence-*

soever, or howsoever [above], or whensoever, ye will is interpreted in all 3 ways. But it does not occur in the

sense of ^{كَيْفَ} or ^{مَتَى} unless it be followed by a v. (R).

It is *uninfl.* because it implies [the sense of (AAz)] the *interrog.* Hamza [or *cond. p.* (AAz)]; and its final is

quiescent according to rule [159] (IY).

THE COMPOUNDS.

§ 208. The *comp.* is every [single (R)] *n.* [resulting (R, Jm)] from [the composition of (R, Jm)] two words, [real or predicamental (Jm), both *ns.*, *vs.*, or *ps.*, or *n.* and *v.*, *n.* and *p.*, or *v.* and *p.* (R, Jm),] between which there is no relation (IH) at all, either at present or before the composition. We say "real or predicamental" in order to include such as ^{سَيِّبِيَّةٌ} [4], because its last member, being a sound not applied to denote a meaning, is not a word [1], but is in the predicament of a word, since it is treated as an *uninfl. n.*; and IH says "between which there is no relation" in order to exclude such as ^{عَبْدُ اللَّهِ} and ^{تَابِعُ شَرٍّ} [4], because between the two members of each of them there is a relation [explained below] before the whole becomes a proper name (Jm). But this definition excludes part of the defined, [vid. the *comp.* in which a *con.* is supplied (R),] as ^{خَمْسَةُ عَشَرَ} [210], [or a *prep.*, as ^{بَيْتُ بَيْتٍ} (211) (R)]; because between its two members there is [some relation, vid. (R)] the relation of coupling (R, Jm) or something else (R): and it is best to say that by "relation" is meant relation comprehensible from the *external form* of the composition, like the relation of prothesis [110] in ^{عَبْدُ اللَّهِ}, and of dependence [44] in ^{تَابِعُ شَرٍّ}; whereas in ^{خَمْسَةُ عَشَرَ}

[210] the *form* of the composition does not indicate any relation at all (Jm). The *comps.* are of two kinds, (1) a kind whose composition requires the two *ns.* to be *uninfl.* together, as ^{عَشْرَةٌ}عَشْرَةٌ together with its unit [210], ^{حَيْصٌ}حَيْصٌ ^{بَيْصٌ}بَيْصٌ, etc. [211], and ^{الْحَازِ}الْحَازِ ^{بَازٍ}بَازٍ [212]; (2) a kind whose composition requires only the 1st of them to be *uninfl.*, as ^{بَدِي}بَدِي [213], ^{أَيْدِي}أَيْدِي ^{سَبَا}سَبَا [214], and ^{مُعْدِيكَرْبٌ}مُعْدِيكَرْبٌ [215] (M). Z puts ^{بَدِي}بَدِي or ^{بَدَا}بَدَا and ^{أَيْدِي}أَيْدِي ^{سَبَا}سَبَا [215] in the *cat.* of ^{مُعْدِيكَرْبٌ}مُعْدِيكَرْبٌ ; but S puts them in the *cat.* of ^{خَمْسَةٌ}خَمْسَةٌ ^{عَشْرٌ}عَشْرٌ, which is more probable, though it be only by way of assimilation, not because the 2nd implies [the sense of] a *p.* [209]: for, if the matter were as Z says, ^{بَدِي}بَدِي and ^{بَدَا}بَدَا would necessarily be declined as triptotes by affixion of Tanwin to them, because they contain composition only, without the quality of proper name [18], whereas they have not been heard pronounced with Tanwīn; and similarly ^{سَبَا}سَبَا would necessarily be pronounced with Tanwīn, because it is here the name of a *man*, not of a *tribe*, as it is interpreted in XXVII. 22. [18] (R).

§ 209. The distinction between the two kinds is that (M), if the 2nd [member (Jm)] imply [the sense of (IY)] a [*con.* or other (Jm)] *p.*, both [members (M, Jm)] are *uninfl.*, [as ^{أَحَدٌ}أَحَدٌ ^{عَشْرٌ}عَشْرٌ (210) and ^{حَيْصٌ}حَيْصٌ ^{بَيْصٌ}بَيْصٌ (211)]

(IY), because the cause of uninflectedness exists in each of them, since the 1st {*n.* (IY)} becomes {through the composition like part of a *n.*, being (IY)} in the same position as the beginning of a word towards its end, while the 2nd implies the sense of the *p.* (M)]; but, if not, the 2nd is *infl.*, and the 1st *uninfl.* (M, IH), in the correctest (IH) *dial.* (Jm), as مَعْدِيكَرَبْ [215] (IY).

§ 210. The *v. f.* of the *num.* exceeding 10 is that the 2nd should be coupled to the 1st, as ثَلَاثَةٌ وَعِشْرَةٌ; then the two *ns.* [the unit and the decimal (IY)] are amalgamated into one, and are *uninfl.* [211, 318] because of the existence of the two causes [209]. Some of the Arabs make the ع quiescent, saying أَحَدٌ عَشَرَ [and ثَلَاثَةٌ عَشَرَ (IY)] to guard against the succession of [6 or 5 (IY)] mobiles in one word, [not more than 4 mobiles being combined in one word: but this is not done in اثْنَا عَشَرَ (318), because two quiescents would then be combined; and because, the ا and ع being quiescent, there is not the same succession of mobiles in these two words as there is in أَحَدٌ عَشَرَ and the like; and because they are not compounded, so that they are not one word (IY)]. The determinative *p.* and prothesis do not spoil the uninflectedness [of this *num.* (IY)]: you say (1) الْوَاحِدُ عَشَرَ The eleven and الْعَادِي عَشَرَ The eleventh [324] to الثَّانِي عَشَرَ The nineteen and الثَّالِثَ عَشَرَ The nineteenth:

(2) ^{أحد عشر} *Thy eleven* and ^{تسعة عشر} *Thy nineteen* [and ^{خامس عشر} *Thy fifteenth* (IY)]: but Akh used to approve the *nom.* when he prefixed it, [as ^{خمس} *Thy fifteen* (IY),] which S deemed corrupt. And, if ^{خوسعة عشر} [or the like *comp.* (IY)] be used as a name for a man, it may (1) be [*infl.*, pronounced with Damm of the *ر* (IY)] in the *nom.*, [and Fath in the *acc.* and *gen.*, being declined as a diptote, like ^{بعلبك} (215), because of the removal of the sense of coupling; and, according to this, when/you prefix, you decline it as a triptote (17), as ^{خمس} *عشر* (IY)]: (2) remain [*uninfl.* (IY),] pronounced with Fath (M), because you imitate its state before it was used as a name (IY).

§ 211. The following synthetic *comps.* are *uninfl.* upon Fath, (1) *nums.* [210]: (2) *advs.*, (a) temporal, as (a) ^{فلان يأتينا صباح مساء} *Such a one comes to us, morning (and) evening, orig. صباحا ومساء, i. e. (*every*) *morning and evening*, the *con.* being suppressed, and the two *advs.* compounded together for the sake of abbreviation in the same way as ^{خمس} *عشر*, whence*

وَمَنْ لَا يَصْرِفِ الْوَأَشِيْنَ عَنْهُ * صَبَاحَ مَسَاءٍ يَبْغُوْهُ خَبَالًا

[*And whoso turns not the slanderers away from himself morning and evening, they will seek insanity for him*

(MAd)]; but, if you prefixed, saying *صَبَاحٌ مَسَاءً*, it would be allowable, i. e. *on a morning possessed of*, [i. e. *succeeded by* (MAd),] *an evening*, like *لَمْ يَلْبَثُوا إِلَّا عَشِيَّةً أَوْ* *LXXIX. 46. Had not tarried in the graves save an afternoon or its forenoon*: (b) *يَاتِينَا يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ*

Such a one comes to us day by day, orig. *يَوْمًا فَيَوْمًا*, i. e. *every day*, whence

*أَتِ الرِّزْقُ يَوْمٌ يَوْمٌ فَاجْمِلْ * طَلِبًا وَابْغِ لِلْقِيَامَةِ زَادًا*

[*Subsistence will come day by day: then moderate desire, and seek provision for the day of resurrection* (MAd)]:

(b) local, as *سَهَّلْتُ الْهَمْزَةَ بَيْنَ بَيْنٍ* *I softened the Hamza betwixt and between* [658], orig. *بَيْنَهَا وَبَيْنَ حَرْفٍ حَرَكْتَهَا* *between it and* [158] *the consonant of its vowel*, what is *post.* to the 1st and 2nd *بَيْنٍ* being suppressed, the *con.* also suppressed, and the two *advs.* compounded together, whence

نَحْمِي حَقِيقَتَنَا وَبَعْدَ قَضِ الْقَوْمِ يَسْقُطُ بَيْنَ بَيْنًا

[by 'Abīd Ibn Al'Abbras, addressing Imra alKais, *We defend our right, when some of the people fall betwixt and between* (AAz)], orig. *بَيْنَ هَؤُلَاءِ وَبَيْنَ هَؤُلَاءِ* *Between these and those*, [i. e. *between the high and the low* (D),] these two *advs.*, which have become one, being in the position of an *acc.* as [an *adv.* depending upon (MAd)]

a [suppressed (MAd)] d. s. [below], since the meaning is
 فَلَانٌ جَارِي بَيْتٍ (MAd): (3) ds. s., as (a) بَيْتٌ
 بَيْتٌ Such a one is my neighbour, tent (to) tent, orig.
 مَلَامَقًا [بَيْتًا مَنُضًا (MAd)] tent joined to tent, i. e.
 adjoining, the prep. ل being suppressed, and the two
 ns. compounded together; though the supplied prep.
 may be إِلَى, [i. e. بَيْتًا مَنُضًا إِلَى بَيْتٍ (MAd)]; or no
 prep. at all may be supplied, but the con. ف, [i. e.
 تَسَاقَطُوا أَحُولَ أَحُولَ (MAd)]: (b) تَسَاقَطُوا
 مَتَقَرِّقِينَ, They fell one after another, scattered about, i. e.
 whence the verse of the poet, describing a bull goring
 dogs,

تَسَاقَطَ عَنْهُ رَوَقُهُ ضَارِيَاتُهَا * سَقَاطُ شَرَارِ الْقَيْنِ أَحُولَ أَحُولًا

[Their bitches trained to hunting dropped off him, off
 his horn, one after another, as the sparks of the blacksmith
 are dropped, scattered about (MAd)]: (a) the difference
 between this sort and the verse cited in the preceding
 sort is that there the comp. depends upon a suppressed
 اسْتَقَرَّ, which is the d. s. [above], whereas here the
 comp. itself is the d. s.: (b) if you exclude any of these
 advs. or ds. s. from the quality of adv. or d. s., prothesis
 is necessary, and composition is disallowed, as هَذِهِ هَمْزَةٌ
 فَلَانٌ يَأْتِينَا كُلَّ صَبَاحٍ مَسَاءً and بَيْنِي بَيْنِي, whence

وَلَوْلَا يَوْمَ يَوْمٍ مَا آرَدْنَا * جَزَآءُكَ وَالْقُرُوضُ لَهَا جَزَآءُ

[And, but for a day succeeded by a day, we should not have wished thy repayment; though for debts there is repayment (MAd)]: (c) *comp. advs.* and *ds. s.* do not occur in the Revelation, but only *comp. nums.*, as XII.

4. [442], ثَانِي عَشْرَةَ مِائَةً ثَلَاثًا عَشْرَةً عَيْنًا II. 57. Then twelve springs gushed out from it, and LXXIV. 30.

[87]: (d) *comp. ds. s.* occur rarely in comparison with *comp. advs.* (Sh). They say (1) تَفَرَّقُوا شَخَرٌ بَخَرٌ [or شَخَرٌ شَخَرٌ] (KF)], i. e. They separated in every direction, without collecting together; (2) similarly شَذَرٌ مَذَرٌ [or شَذَرٌ مَذَرٌ] (H, KF)] or شَذَرٌ بَذَرٌ, all meaning separation without collecting together; (3) in the same sense خَذَعٌ مَذَعٌ; (4) تَرَكُوا الْبِلَادَ حَيْثُ حَيْثُ They left the countries, dispersing

abroad [or حَيْثُ حَيْثُ (KF)] or حَاتٌ بَاتٌ or حَوَتْ بَوَتْ or حَوَتْ بَوَتْ [or حَوَتْ بَوَتْ] (KF)], with Tanwīn by assimilation to the *indet. ejs.* [198], when they separate and disperse (IY): the two *ns.* are in the place of an *acc.* as a *d. s.* (H); and the *o. f.* is شَخَرًا وَبَخَرًا and مَذَرًا وَمَذَرًا and حَيْثًا وَبَيْثًا and خَذَعًا وَمَذَعًا (M). The [synthetic (MAd)] composition mentioned occurs also in what is not an *adv.* or *d. s.*, as وَقَعُوا فِي حَيْصٍ بَيْصٍ, i. e. They fell into a difficulty hard to escape from; but this is

anomalous (Sh). The *n. f.* is ^{وَقَعُوا فِي حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (M), the *و* being then suppressed for abbreviation, while the sense is copulative; so that ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} implies the sense of the *con.*, and is therefore *uninfl.*, like ^{خَمْسَةَ عَشَرَ} and its *cat.* [210] (IY). They say (1) ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ}, [which is the frequent and well-known *dial. var.*, as in the verse of Umayya Ibn Abi 'Ā'idh alHudhali cited by As

قَدْ كُنْتُ خَرَجًا وَوَجًا صَيْرَفًا
لَمْ تَلْتَحِصْنِي حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ لِحَاصٍ

(IY) *I have been wont to go out, and come in, versatile: adversity has not stuck to me inextricably*, ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} being here in the position of an *acc.* as a *d. s.*, i. e. *in this state of* ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (DH)]; (2) ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (DH, IY, KF); (3) ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (KF); (4) ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (IY); (5) ^{حَيْصًا وَيَيْصًا}; (6) ^{حَيْصٍ وَيَيْصٍ} (IY, KF).

§ 212. ^{الْكَازِبُ} ^{بَارٍ} is compounded of the *act. parts.* of ^{خَزَا} *overcame* and ^{بَرَا} *exalted himself*, as though ^{هُوَ} ^{الْكَازِبُ} ^{وَالْبَارِي} were said (R). It has (1) 7 *dials. vars.* (a) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (b) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (c) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (d) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (e) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (f) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}; (g) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}, like ^{قَاعَسَاءُ} [391]; (g) ^{خَزَا بَارٍ}, like ^{قِرْطَاسٌ} [396]:

(2) 5 meanings [transmitted by Sf (IY)], (a) a *kind of herbage*, [as in the saying {of the Rājiz (AAz) cited by IAr (IY)}]

رَعَيْتَهَا أَكْرَمَ عَوْدٍ * عَوْدًا * الصَّلِّ وَالصَّفْصَلِ وَالْيَعْضِيدِ

وَالْخَاخِ بَارِزِ السِّنِّ الْمَجْرُودِ * بِحَيْثُ يَدْعُو عَامِرٌ مَسْعُودًا

(M) *I have pastured them upon a most noble branch as a branch, the plants named صَلِّ and صَفْصَل and the herb named يَعْضِيد and the tall flowering herbage named خَاخِ watered with rain, so that 'Āmir calls Mas'ūd (these being two pastors) to rejoice at the abundance of herbage (IY)]; (b) a [blue (IY)] fly that is in herbage, [as says the poet { 'Amr (AAz) Ibn Ahmar (IY, AAz) }*

تَفَقَّ فَرْقَةُ الْقَلْعِ السَّوَارِي * وَجَى الْخَاخِ بَارِزٍ بِهِ جُنُونًا

(M) *The masses of cloud coming by night burst with water above it {i. e. the low ground or the herbage (IY)}, and the fly named خَاخِ buzzed loudly in it (IY, AAz)]; (c) [an imitation of (IY)] the sound of the fly, [says As (IY)]; (d) a disease in the [necks and (IY)] jawbones projecting under the ears, [as in the saying {of the Rājiz (IY, AAz), vid. Al'Adawī (IY), }*

يَا خَاخِ بَارِزِ أَرْسِلِ اللَّهَازِمَا * إِنِّي أَخَافُ أَنْ تَكُونَ لَازِمًا

(M) *O disease named خَاخِ, release the jawbones projecting under the ears: verily I fear that thou mayst*

become chronic (AAz)]; (e) the *cat.* (M, R), which is the strangest of them (IY).

§ 213. The *o. f.* of **فَاعِلٌ هَٰذَا بَادِي بَدِي** *Do this first of every thing* or **بَادِي بَدَا**, [i. e. **أَوَّلَ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ** (IY),] is **بَادِي بَدِي** [upon the measure of **فَاعِلٌ** (IY)] or **بَدَا** [upon the measure of **فَاعِلٌ** (IY)], which is then lightened by rejecting the Hamza [of **بَدِي** or **بَدَا** (IY)] and [converting the Hamza of **بَادِي** into a pure **ي**, and (IY)] making [it (IY)] quiescent. It [consists of two *ns.* compounded together and *uninfl.* (210); and (IY)] is [*indet.* (IY),] governed in the *acc.* as a *d. s.*, i. e. **مَبْتَدَأًا بِهِ قَبْلَ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ** *beginning with it before every thing*. [They say also **بَدِي بَدَا** with prothesis, without uninflectedness (IY):] and it is sometimes used pronounced with Hamza [in the 2nd, not the 1st, as **بَدِي بَدَا** or **بَدِي**; or in both, as **بَادِي بَدَا** (IY)], whence the tradition of Zaid Ibn Thābit **أَمَّا بَادِي بَدَا فَنَانِي أَحْمَدُ اللَّهُ** *As for the first of every thing, verily I praise God*.

§ 214. They say **ذَهَبُوا أَيَادِي سَبَا** *They went away (like) the children of Sabā* or **أَيَادِي سَبَا** [549], i. e. *(like) the children of Sabā* Ibn Yashjub [Ibn Ya'rub Ibn Kahtān (IY)] in their separation and dispersion in the

countries when the Flood of the Dams was sent against them, ^{أيد} being a *met.* for *children* and *kindred*. [It has 2 *dial. vars.*: (1) the 2 *ns.* are compounded into one, and *uninfl.* (210); (2) the 1st is *pre.* to the 2nd, as in ^{صَبَاحَ مَسَاءَ} (211). It is in the position of an *acc.* as a *d. s.*, i. e. ^{مُتَبَدِّدِينَ} and ^{مُتَفَرِّقِينَ} and the like. And the Hamza of ^{سَبَا} is omitted for abbreviation, because of the length of the *n.* and the frequency of usage, together with the heaviness of the Hamza (IY)].

§ 215. ^{مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ} has 2 *dial. vars.*:—(1) composition and diptote declension [of the 2nd, the 1st being *uninfl.* (209), because it occupies the position of part of a word (IY)], as ^{هَذَا مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ} This is *Ma'dīkarīb* [18]: (2) prefixion, the *post.* being declined as (a) a triptote, as ^{هَذَا مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ}; (b) a diptote, as ^{هَذَا مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ} [below]. And similar are ^{قَالِي قَلَا} [below], ^{حَضْرَمَوْتُ} [4], ^{بُعْلَبَكْ}, and their likes (M). When ^{مَعْدِي} is *pre.*, its *ي* is not pronounced with Fath in the *acc.* [16], so that you do not say ^{رَأَيْتُ مَعْدِي كَرِبٌ}, as you say ^{رَأَيْتُ قَاضِي وَاسِطَ} The judge of *Wāsīt*, because, being made quiescent in the state of composition, as ^{هَذَا مَعْدِيكَرِبٌ}, which is a position where the sound [letter] is pronounced

with Fath, as ^{حَضْرَمَوْتُ}, it is made quiescent in the state of inflection also. In ^{كُرْبٍ مَعْدِي} you hold ^{كُرْبٍ} to be a *masc.* [proper] name, and therefore decline it as a triptote [18]. But in ^{كُرْبٍ مَعْدِي} [above], with Fath in every case, there are 2 alternatives:—(1) ^{مَعْدِي} may be *pre.* to ^{كُرْبٍ}, the latter being held to be a *fem.* proper name, and therefore diptote [18]; and, according to this, both *ns.* are *infl.*: (2) they may be compounded and *uninfl.*, like ^{خُمْسَةَ عَشْرَ}, as though the 2 *ns.*, before being used as a [proper] name, had been compounded and *uninfl.*, upon the ground that the , was meant to be understood, and then they were used as a name after the composition (IY). S reckons ^{قَالِي قَالَا} among the sisters of ^{أَيْدِي سَبَا} [208]: but Z reckons it among the sisters of ^{مَعْدِي كُرْبٍ}; and it contains no evidence to support the opinion of S, because the aggregate of the two words is the proper name of a city [in Armenia (MI)], so that it may be diptote because of the composition and quality of proper name [18], but is not *uninfl.* (R).

THE UNINFLECTED METONYMS.

§ 216. Metonymy in classical and conventional language is denoting a particular thing, whether it be an expression or a meaning, by an expression not plainly indicative of it, (1) for the sake of perplexing some of the hearers, as in your saying *جَانَنِي فَلَانٌ* *Such a one came to me*, when you mean *Zaid*; (2) because of the unseemliness of the thing expressed, like *هَنِي* for the *vulva* or *foul act* [14]; (3) for the sake of abridgment, like the *prons.* relating to a preceding expression [160]; (4) for a sort of elegance, like *كَثِيرُ الرَّمَادِ* *Plentiful in ashes* for *كَثِيرُ الْقَرَى* *Plentiful in hospitality*; (5) for some other object. If the thing denoted by the *met.* be an expression, what is intended is (1) the meaning of that expression, as in

كَانَ فَعَلَتْ لَمْ تَعْلَمْ مَوَاقِبَهَا * دِيَارَ بَكْرٍ وَلَمْ تَخْلَعْ وَلَمْ تَهَبْ

[by AlMutanabbî, lamenting the eldest sister of Saif adDaula, *It is as though the cavalcades of Khaula (her name) had not filled the countries of Bakr, and she had not bestowed, and had not given (W)*], i. e. *خَوْلَةٌ*, and in *مَرَرْتُ بِرَجُلٍ أَفْعَلٍ* *I passed by a foolish man*, i. e. *أَحْمَقٌ*: (2) merely that expression, as in (a) puzzles and

riddles, as ^{أَكْفُفْ أَكْفُفْ} أَكْفُفْ أَكْفُفْ for ^{مَهْمَةٌ} مَهْمَةٌ ; (b) the measures used in the conventional language of the GG to denote the words measured by them, as ^{أَفْعَلْ صِفَةً لَا يَنْصَرِفُ} [9], i. e. ^{أَفْعَلْ} أَفْعَلْ, when an epithet, is not declined as a triptote, where ^{أَفْعَلْ} أَفْعَلْ denotes a word whose initial is an aug. Hamza followed by a quiescent ف, followed by an ع pronounced with Fath, followed by a ج, and similarly with the other measures. According to this, then, the interrog. ^{كَمْ} كَمْ [217] is a *met.*, because it denotes a question about a particular number; and so are ^{مَنْ} مَنْ [182], ^{مَا} مَا [180], ^{كَيْفَ} كَيْفَ [207], ^{أَيْنَ} أَيْنَ [206], and other interrog. ns., because each of them is a question about a particular thing not plainly expressed by its name; and so are all the cond. ns., because the cond. and interrog. words are in the sense of ^{أَيُّ} أَيُّ, which, whether cond. or interrog. [184], is applied to denote a particular thing. These ns., whether cond. or interrog., are used as *mets.* for unlimited particular things, for the sake of abridgment, since, if, instead of ^{أَيْنَ} أَيْنَ Where?, you said ^{أَمِ فِي السُّوقِ أَمْ فِي الدَّارِ أَمْ فِي الْكَافَةِ} أَمِ فِي السُّوقِ أَمْ فِي الدَّارِ أَمْ فِي الْكَافَةِ In the house, or in the market, or in the shop, etc? to the end of the other particular places, it would be too long: so that the cond. or interrog. p. is supplied before these ns., as S holds; and they are *mets.* for many particular things, as we have explained. All *mets.* are

not *uninfl.*; for ^{فُلَانٌ}فُلَانٌ and ^{فُلَانَةٌ}فُلَانَةٌ, which belong to them by common consent [14], are *infl.* (R). The [*uninfl.* (IY, R)] *met.* are ^{كَمْ}كَمْ, ^{كُنَا}كُنَا, [and ^{كَايِنْ}كَايِنْ (R, A)] for [*vague* (M)] *number*, and ^{كَيْتٌ}كَيْتٌ and ^{ذَيْتٌ}ذَيْتٌ for the *narrative* [226] (M, IH, A) and *announcement* (M). The *interrog.* and *cond. ns.* [184] are not reckoned here, because they have another *cat.*, [that of the conjunct or *adv.*,] to which they are more appropriate. Thus the *met.* are like the *adv.* [201] in being of two kinds, *infl.* and *uninfl.* (R).

§ 217. ^{كَمْ}كَمْ is a *n.* denoting *number vague* (IA, A) in *genus and quantity* [226] (A). It is [of two kinds (M, ML, A),] (1) *interrog.*, [meaning *How many?* (ML, A)]; (2) *enunciatory* (M, IA, ML, A), meaning *How many!* (ML, A). The *interrog.* and *enunciatory* ^{كَمْ}كَمْ both denote *number* and *numbered*, the *interrog.* denoting *number vague to the speaker, but known to the person addressed in the opinion of the speaker*; and the *enunciatory* denoting *number vague to the hearer* [223], and *seldom known to the speaker*: while the *numbered* is *unknown to the speaker* in the *interrog.* and *enunciatory* (R); and [for this reason (R)] each of them needs a *sp.* [below] (R, IA, A) explanatory of the *numbered* (R). The *sp.* of the 1st is like that of ^{عَشْرُونَ}عَشْرُونَ and its sisters [85, 315], being an *acc.* [224] *sing.* [220]: and the *sp.* of the 2nd is sometimes like that of ^{عَشْرَةٌ}عَشْرَةٌ, being a *gen. pl.*, [as

كَمْ مُلُوكٍ بَادَ مُلْكُهُمْ * وَنَعِيمٍ سُوقَةٍ بَادُوا

Of how many kings has the kingdom perished, and how many prosperous subjects have perished ! (A)]; and sometimes like that of مَائَةٌ, being a *gen. sing.* [220] (IA, A), as كَمْ عَمَّةٍ أَخٍ [224] (A). The *interrog.* and *enunciatory* كَمْ agree in [11] matters (ML, A): (1) they are *ns.* [2] (IY, IA, ML, A), because (a) the *prep.* is prefixed to كَمْ (IY, IA); (b) it is *pre.*, *post.*, and *predicated of*; (c) the *n.* is made a *subst.* for it; (d) the *pron.* relates to it; and (e) it is an *obj.* [218, 222] (IY): (2) they are *uninfl.* (IY, ML, A), because (a) the *interrog.* implies the sense, and occurs in the place, of the *p.* [159]; and (b) the *enunciatory* is of the same letter as the *interrog.*, and occurs in the place of رُبَّ [505], which it resembles in that رُبَّ denotes *paucity of the genus*, and كَمْ *multitude of it*, while every *genus* contains *much* and *little*, the *much* being compounded of the *little*, and the *little* being part of the *much*, so that *much* and *little* are partners (IY): (3) their *uninflectedness* is upon *quiescence* [159] (IY, A): (4) they are *vague* (ML): (5) they need a *sp.* [above] (ML, A) because of their *vagueness*: (6) [219] (A): (7) [225] (IH): (8) they [must (ML, A)] take the head of the sentence (IH, ML, IA, A), (a) the *interrog.* because of the *interrogation* [584]; and (b) the *enunciatory* because of the *originative sense* implied by it in denoting *multitude*, as رُبَّ must take the head

of the sentence because of the originative sense implied by it in denoting *paucity* [505] (R): and therefore they are not governed by what precedes them [445], except the *pre. n.* and *prep.* [218]: (9) they are parsed alike [218] (A): (10) [223]: (11) [222] (R). They differ in [8 (A)] matters:—(1) the sentence with the enunciatory admits of being pronounced true or false, contrary to the sentence with the *interrog.* [1]: (2) the enunciatory does not require a reply, contrary to the *interrog.*: (3) the *subst.* for the enunciatory is not conjoined with the Hamza, as ^{كَمْ عَبِيدَ لِي خَمْسُونَ بَلْ سِتُونَ} *How many slaves I have! Fifty: nay, sixty!*, contrary to the *subst.* for the *interrog.* [154], as ^{كَمْ مَالِكَ أَعَشْرُونَ أَمْ ثَلَاثُونَ} *How many dirhams [219] is, or are [218], thy property? Twenty or thirty?*: (4) the *sp.* of the *interrog.* is [*orig.* (A)] in the *acc.* [224]; whereas the *sp.* of the enunciatory is [*orig.* (A)] in the *gen.* [224]: (5) [220] (ML, A): (6) [221]: (7) the *interrog.* does not indicate *multitude*; whereas the enunciatory does, contrary to the opinion of ITr and his pupil IKh: (8) the enunciatory is peculiar to the *pret.*, like ^{دَبْ} [505].

§ 218. The 2 kinds of ^{كَمْ}, (1) if preceded by a *prep.* or *pre. n.*, [as ^{عَلَّامَ كَمْ رَجُلٍ} or ^{بَكَمْ دِرْهَمٍ أَشْتَرَيْتَ}], are governed in the *gen.*: (2) if not, then, (a) if *met.* for an *inf. n.* or *adv.*, [as ^{كَمْ ضَرْبَةٌ ضَرْبَتْ} or

كَمْ يَوْمًا صَحَّتْ (Sn),] are governed in the *acc.* as *inf.* ns. or *adv.*: (b) if not, then, (a) if not immediately followed by a *v.* [as كَمْ رَجُلٍ فِي الدَّارِ (Sn),] or, if followed by a *v.* that is *intrans.*,] as كَمْ رَجُلٍ قَامَ (Sn),] or that [is *trans.*, but (Sn)] governs their *pron.* or their connected in the *nom.*, [as كَمْ رَجُلٍ ضَرَبَ عَمْرًا or ضَرَبَ أَخْرَهُ كَمْ (Sn),] are *inchs.* [below]; (b) if followed by a *trans.* *v.* that has not got its *obj.*, [whether it govern one or more *objs.*, as كَمْ رَجُلٍ ضَرَبَتْ or كَمْ تَعْطَى زَيْدًا (Sn),] are *objs.*; whereas, if it has got its *obj.*, [as كَمْ رَجُلٍ ضَرَبَ كَمْ زَيْدٌ عَمْرًا عِنْدَهُ (Sn),] they are *inchs.*, unless the *obj.* be a *pron.* relating to them, [as كَمْ رَجُلٍ ضَرَبْتَهُ (Sn),] in which case they are *inchs.* or *accs.* by distraction [62] (A), the former, says Dm, being preferable (Sn). كَمْ in [217, 219] may be the *enunc.* or *inch.* [above] (1Y).

§ 219. The *sp.* [of both kinds (Jm, A)] is sometimes suppressed [87] (M, IH, IA, ML, A), when indicated (R, IA, Jm, A,) as كَمْ مَالِكٌ *How many (dirhams or dinārs) is, or are* [218], *thy property?* (M, IH), i. e. كَمْ دِرْهَمًا or دِينَارًا (M, Jm), or *How many (etc) thy property is!* or *are thy property!*, i. e. كَمْ دِرْهَمٍ or دِينَارٍ (Jm), and

كَمْ ضَرَبْتَ How many (times or strokes) hast thou struck?, or thou hast struck! (IH), i. e. كَمْ مَرَّةً or ضَرْبَةً (Jm); but suppression is not good with the enunciatory, because suppression of the *post.* with retention of the *pre.* is bad [128] (IY).

§ 220. The *sp.* of the *interrog.* is always *sing.* (M, ML, A), unrestrictedly (A), i. e. whether *sorts* be meant by it or not (Sn), contrary to the opinion of the KK (ML, A), who allow it to be *pl.* (A, DM), unrestrictedly (A); and in كَمْ لَكَ غُلَامَاتٍ How many (persons) hast thou, being servants? the *sp.* is [held by the BB to be (Sn)] suppressed, غُلَامَاتٍ being [governed in the *acc.* as (M)] a *d. s.* (M, Sn) by the verbal sense contained in the *adv.* [75], i. e. كَمْ نَفْسًا لَكَ غُلَامَاتٍ (M), i. e. خَدَمَاتًا [77] (Sn): but some make a distinction, saying that, if the question be about *multitudes*, as كَمْ غُلَامَاتٍ لَكَ meaning *How many sorts of servants hast thou?*, it is allowable, but otherwise not; and this is the opinion of Akh (A). According to the BB, you do not say كَمْ رَجُلًا وَنِسَاءً; but some GG allow it, because what is not allowable in the *ant.* is allowable in the *appos.* [538], as الْوَاهِبُ الْغَائِبَةُ الْغَنَى [112] (R). The *sp.* of the enunciatory is *sing.*, [as كَمْ عَمَّةٍ الْغَنَى كَمْ مَلُوكٍ الْغَنَى (224) (ML)] ; or *pl.* (ML, A), as كَمْ مَلُوكٍ الْغَنَى [217]

(ML): but the *sing.* is more frequent and chaste than the *pl.*; though the *pl.* is not anomalous, as some assert (A).

§ 221. The *interrog.* (R, A) كَمْ may be separated from its *sp.* (IY, R, A) by the *adv.* and *prep.* (IY) in a case of choice (R, A), as كَمْ لَكَ غُلَامًا *How many servants hast thou?* (IY, R); but the enunciatory is not separated from its *sp.*, except in a case of necessity [below] (A), if its *sp.* be governed in the *gen.* by prothesis, so that XLIV. 24. [below] is not an instance to the contrary (Sn). The *sp.* of the *interrog.* كَمْ is always in the *acc.* [224] (IY). When the enunciatory is separated from its *sp.*, the latter is governed in (1) the *acc.* (M, A) by assimilation to [the *sp.* of] the *interrog.*, (a) necessarily, if the separation be by a *prop.*, or by an *adv.* and *prep.* and *gen.* together (A), because separation of the *pre.* and *post.* [225] is bad [125], especially by something else than the *prep.* and *gen.* [498] (IY), as

كَمْ نَالَنِي مِنْهُمْ فَضْلًا عَلَى عَدَمٍ * إِنْ لَا أَكُنْ مِنَ الْأَقْتَارِ أَحْتِمِلُ

[by AlKutāmī, *How many a bounty has reached me from them in destitution, when I was not near to journeying from poverty* (IY, AAz) for want of a riding-beast (AAz)] and

تَوَّجُّمٌ سِنَانًا وَكَمْ دُونَهُ * مِنَ الْأَرْضِ مُحْدَوْدِبًا غَارَهَا

(M, A), by Zuhair [or his son Ka'b, though not found in their *Diwāns* (FA), or by Ibn Mukbil (AAz), describing his she-camel (IY)], *She seeks Sinān* [Ibn Abī Ḥāritha

alMurri (FA)], and how many a tract of ground whose hollow is rugged is before him! (IY, AAz, FA); (b) preferably, if the separation be by an *adv.* alone, or by a *prep.* and *gen.* alone, as in the next *exs.* (Sn): (2) the *gen.*, in poetry (M, A) exclusively, with separation by (a) an *adv.*, as

كَمْ دُونَ مَيَّةٍ مَوَاةٍ يَهَالُ لَهَا * إِذَا تَيَمَّمَهَا الصَّخْرِيَّتُ ذُو الْجَلَدِ
[How many a desert that the skilful, hardy guide is appalled at, when he directs his course to it, is before Mayya! (Sn)]; (b) a *prep.* and *gen.* (A), as

كَمْ فِي بَنِي سَعْدِ بْنِ بَكْرِ سَيِّدٍ * ضَخْمٍ الْوَسِيعَةِ مَاجِدٍ نَفَّاعٍ
(M, A), by AlFarazdak (IY, FA), How many a chief, large in bounty, glorious, very beneficent, is among the Banu Sa'd Ibn Bakr! (IY, AAz, FA), and

كَمْ بِجَبُونٍ مُقَرِّفٍ نَالَ الْعُلَى * وَكَرِيمٍ بَخْلَةً قَدْ وَضَعَهُ
(IY, A) How many a mongrel has by munificence attained eminence, and how many a noble has his own niggardliness abased! (Sn): so says IM, and this is the opinion of S (A). When the separation between the enunciatory كَمْ and its *sp.* is by a *trans. v.*, مِنْ must be put, in order that the *sp.* may not be confounded with the *obj.* of that [*trans.* (R)] *v.*, as كَمْ تَرَكُوا مِنْ جَنَّاتٍ XLIV. 24. How many gardens did they leave! [above] (R, Sn). And, with separation, the state of the *interrog.* كَمْ whose *sp.* is governed in the *gen.* [224] is like that of the enunciatory كَمْ (R).

§ 222. كُمْ [in both its states (R)] is *sing. masc.* in letter (IY, R); but applies in sense to the *fem., du.* [below], and *pl.* (IY). The *pron.* relates to it according to the letter or sense (M, R), as كُمْ رَجُلًا جَائِكُمْ [notwithstanding that the number asked about is *du.* or *pl.* (R)] or جَائِكُمْ [says An (R)] or جَائُوكُمْ, and كُمْ امْرَأَةً جَائِكُمْ, and جَائِكُمْ (IY, R), whence جَائِكُمْ [or جَائُوكُمْ (IY)] or جَائِكُمْ (IY, R), whence كُمْ مِنْ مَلِكٍ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ لَا تَغْنِي شَفَاعَتُهُمْ شَيْئًا LIII. 26. And the intercession of how many Angels in the heavens shall avail not aught! (M) and VII. 3. [126] (IY). But some say that كُمْ is *sing.* in letter, *pl.* in sense, like كَلٌّ [117]: and, according to this, the *pron.* of the *du.* [above] ought not to relate to it, which is the truth, because, if you might interrogate with كُمْ about the number of the multitude who came to the person addressed distributed into two and two, you would be obliged to say كُمْ رَجُلَيْنِ, since, when you intend to distribute a multitude into sets of two or more, the *du.* or *pl.* must be distinctly expressed, as in كُمْ اَفْضَلُ رَجُلَيْنِ or رَجَالٍ [118] and اَيُّ رَجُلَيْنِ or رَجَالٍ Which, or What, two men, or men?; whereas كُمْ رَجُلَيْنِ has not been heard, either in interrogation or enunciation.

§ 223. كُمْ is peculiar to *indets.*, the *interrog.* because the *sp.* must be *indet.* [83]; and the enunciatory because

it is a *met.* for *number vague to the hearer* [217], so that the *numbered* also are made vague, in order to be more indicative of the vagueness of their *number* (R). You say ^{كَمْ} ^{غَيْرَةً} لَكَ or ^{مِثْلَهُ} or ^{خَيْرًا مِنْهُ} *How many other than, or like, or better than, it hast thou?* [114, 355]; and ^{كَمْ} ^{غَيْرَةً} ^{مِثْلَهُ} لَكَ *How many other than it, like it, hast thou?*, making ^{مِثْلَهُ} an *ep.* of ^{غَيْرَةً} (M). But, as for your saying ^{كَمْ} ^{شَاةٌ} ^{وَسَخَلَتْهَا} *How many a sheep etc!* [538] and ^{كَمْ} ^{نَاقَةٌ} ^{وَفَصِيلَهَا} [114], it is because the coupled also is *indet.* [262] (R).

§ 224. As to the case of the *sp.* of the *interrog.* there are three opinions, (1) that the *acc.* [221] is necessary unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether a *prep.* be prefixed to ^{كَمْ} or not (Sn)]: (2) that it is not necessary; but that the *gen.* [221] is allowable, unrestrictedly, by assimilation to [the *sp.* of] the enunciatory ^{كَمْ} [225]: this is the opinion of Fr, Zj, and Sf; and the saying ^{كَمْ} ^{عَمَّةٌ} ^{الْحُ} [below] is thus explained by most, [upon the ground that ^{كَمْ} is an ironical *interrog.* (Sn)]: (3) that it is necessary if a *prep.* be not prefixed to ^{كَمْ}, and preferable to the *gen.* if a *prep.* be prefixed to it: this is the well known opinion; and S does not mention the *gen.* except when a *prep.* is prefixed to ^{كَمْ} (A). The

gen. is allowable only when كَمْ is governed in the *gen.* by a *prep.* (R, ML), as بِكُمْ دَرَهُمْ أَشْتَرِيْتُ [515] (ML, A), in which case the *sp.* may be in (1) the *acc.*, [which is frequent (ML)] ; (2) the *gen.* (R, ML, A), contrary to the opinion of some (ML), in order that كَمْ and its *sp.* may agree in case (R). As some assert (ML), some of the Arabs (IY, R), the Banu Tamīm (IY, ML, A), make the enunciatory كَمْ govern its [*sing.* (R, ML, A) or *pl.* (R, Sn)] *sp.* in the *acc.* (IY, R, ML, A), even without separation [221] (R), as though they supplied Tanwīn in it [84] ; which is good Arabic, though the *gen.* is more frequent (IY). And the verse [of AlFarazdaq (M, ML, Sn), who was a Tamīmī (IY, Sn),]

كَمْ عَمَّةٌ لَكَ يَا جَرِيرُ وَخَالَتُ * قَدَعَاءُ قَدْ حَلَبْتُ عَلَى عِشَارِي

is related with (1) the *acc.*, (a) by supposing كَمْ to be [an ironical (ML, A)] *interrog.*, *How many paternal aunts of thine, O Jarīr, and maternal aunts, bow-legged have milked in spite of me my lately delivered she-camels ?*; [(b) according to the *dial.* of Tamīm, *How many a paternal aunt of thine, O Jarīr, and maternal aunt, have milked etc!* (IY, ML, A)] : (2) the *gen.*, by supposing كَمْ to be [an ironical *interrog.* (above) or] enunciatory [217] : (3) the *nom.* [as an *inch.* (25) (IY, ML, A)], by supposing the sense to be *How many (times)* (M, ML, A) or

(*milkings*), ^{كَمْ} being an *adv.* or *inf. n.* (IY, ML, A), and the *sp.* suppressed, i. e. ^{كَمْ} ^{وَقْتُ} or ^{حَلْبَةٌ} [upon the supposition that ^{كَمْ} is enunciatory, or ^{وَقْتُ} or ^{حَلْبَةٌ} upon the supposition that it is an ironical *interrog.* (DM)], has a *paternal aunt of thine, O Jarīr, and (has) a maternal aunt, or (has) a paternal etc, and has a maternal aunt,* a 2nd ^{قَدْ حَلَبْتُ} being necessarily supplied [as *enunc.* of ^{خَالَةٌ} or ^{عَمَةٌ} (Sn, DM)], because the *inch.* in this case is multiple in letter and sense (ML, A).

§ 225. When the *sp.* of the *interrog.* ^{كَمْ} is in the *gen.* [224], it is governed, [according to the GG (R),] by ^{مِنْ} [necessarily (ML)] understood [515], [which is the opinion of Khl, S, Fr, and many (A)]; but, according to Zj, by prothesis (R, ML, A), as in the case of the enunciatory (R). The enunciatory is *pre.* to its *sp.* [221], governing it as every *pre.* governs the *post.* [110] (M). ^{مِنْ} is [frequently (M)] prefixed [to the *sp.* (IY, R, Jm)] after the [*interrog.* and (IH)] enunciatory ^{كَمْ} (M, IH): that construction is frequent in the case of the enunciatory (R, Jm), as VII. 3. [126] and LIII. 26. [222] (M, R, Jm), because the prothesis here is renderable by ^{مِنْ} [111], as in ^{بَابُ سَاجٍ} [85] (IY), [and] because the *sp.* then agrees in case with the *sp. post.* to ^{كَمْ};

but, as for the *interrog.* كَمْ, I have not met with its *sp.* governed in the *gen.* by مِّنْ in poetry or prose, nor is its allowability indicated by any book on grammar (R, Jm), nor do I know what is the truth of it (R): so says R; but Z [followed by B] allows كَمْ in II. 207. [62] to be *interrog.* and enunciatory (Jm). And, when the *sp.* is governed in the *gen.* by مِّنْ, then كَمْ is [necessarily (R)] construed to be pronounced with Tanwīn [110] (M, R), as though you said مِّنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ and كَثِيرٌ مِّنَ الْقُرَى; while, according to some, [vid. the KK (IY),] كَمْ is always [construed to be (IY)] pronounced with Tanwīn, the *gen.* after it being governed by مِّنْ [expressed or (IY)] understood (M).

§ 226. كَذَا and كَافٍ are like the enunciatory كَمْ in denoting *multitude* (IĀ, A) of *number vague in genus and quantity* [217]. Each of them agrees with كَمْ in some matters, and differs from it in others. كَذَا agrees with كَمْ in 4 matters, uninflectedness, vagueness, needing the *sp.*, and importing *multitude*. And it differs from كَمْ in 4 matters:— (1) it is compounded of the ك of *comparison* [509] and the *dem.* ذَا [171] (A): (2) it does not [necessarily (A)] take the head of the sen-

tence, as *قَبَضْتُ كَذَا وَكَذَا دِرْهَمًا* *I took so many dirhams :*

(3) it is mostly used coupled to, as

عَدِ النَّفْسِ نَعْمَى بَعْدَ بُؤْسَاكِ ذَاكِرًا

كَذَا وَكَذَا لُطْفًا بِهِ نَسِيَ الْجَهْدَ

[*Promise the soul happiness after thy distress, remembering so many pleasures wherewith hardship has been forgotten* (Jsh)]; and IKh asserts that they do not say

كَذَا كَذَا دِرْهَمًا nor *كَذَا دِرْهَمًا*; but IM mentions that

this has been heard, though rarely: (4) its *sp.* must be governed in the *acc.*; and may not be governed in the

gen. by *مِنْ*, by common consent; nor by prothesis, contrary to the opinion of the KK, who, when there is

neither repetition or coupling, allow *كَذَا ثَوْبٌ* and *كَذَا ثَوْبٌ* by analogy to the genuine *num.*, [like *مِائَةُ ثَوْبٍ*

and *ثَلَاثَةُ أَثَوَابٍ* (DM)]. The compounded *كَذَا* [single

or coupled (A)] occurs also as a *met.* for something else than *number*, [vid. the *narrative, det. or indet.* (A), i. e. the *expression occurring in the narration of a thing, whether*

deed or saying (Sn),] whence the tradition *يُقَالُ لِلْعَبْدِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ*

اَتَذْكُرُ يَوْمَ كَذَا وَكَذَا *It will be said to the servant*

on the day of resurrection, Dost thou remember the day

of *such and such*? : and كَذَا also consists of two words in their original sense, vid. the ك of *comparison* and *dem.*

ذَا, whence

وَأَسْلَمَنِي الزَّمَانُ كَذَا • فَلَا طَرْبُ وَلَا اِنْسُ

[*And time has abandoned me* *grieved like this*; so that there is neither mirth nor sociability (DM)] ; and the premonitory هَا [551] is prefixed to it, as اهْكَذَا عَرْشُكَ

XXVII. 42. *Is thy throne like this?* كَايْنُ agrees with كَمْ in 5 matters, uninflectedness, vagueness, needing the *sp.*, always taking the head of the sentence, and importing sometimes *multitude*, which is mostly the case, [as III. 140. (24) (ML),] and sometimes *interrogation* [below], which is extraordinary, and is authorized only by IKb, IU, and IM, the last of whom cites as evidence the saying of Ubayy Ibn Ka'b to Ibn Mas'ūd كَايْنُ تَقْرَأُ سُورَةَ الْأَحْزَابِ آيَةً *How many verses readest* [i. e. reckonest (Sn)] *thou the Chapter of The Confederates* [Kur. XXXIII] *to be* ?, upon which he said "Seventy-three." And it differs from كَمْ in 5 [or rather 6] matters :— (1) it is compounded of the ك of *comparison* and اَي, for which reason it may be paused upon with the و, because the Tanwīn, when affixed in composition, resembles the *rad.* و, for which reason it is written in

the Codex as a ^{٥٦٤}كَيْنِ; while he that pauses [upon ^{٥٦٤}كَيْنِ (ML)] with elision of the ^{٥٦٤}كَيْنِ has regard to its predicament in the *o. f.*, namely elision in pause [609]: whereas ^{٥٦٤}كَمْ is simple: (2) its *sp.* is governed (a) in the *gen.* by ^{٥٦٤}مِنْ, which is so often the case that IU asserts it to be always so, whence III. 140. [above]; (b) in the *acc.*, as

أَطْرَدَ الْيَاسَ بِالرَّجَاءِ فَكَأَنَّ * أَلَمًا حَمَّ يَمْسِرُهُ بَعْدَ عُسْرٍ

[*Drive away despair with hope: for how many a pain-stricken wretch has had his ease decreed after distress!* (Jsh)] and

وَكَأَنَّ لَنَا فَضْلًا عَلَيْكُمْ وَمِنَّةٌ * قَدِيمًا وَلَا تَدْرُونَ مَا مَنَىٰ مِنَّا

[*And how many favors and obligations have we conferred upon you aforetime! And ye know not what obligations a benefactor has conferred!* (Jsh)]: (3) it does not occur as an *interrog.*, according to the majority, as shown above: (4) it does not occur governed in the *gen.*, con-

trary to the opinion of IKb and IU, who allow ^{٥٦٤}بِكَأَنَّ تَبِيعَ هَذَا الثَّوْبِ ^{٥٦٤}For how much wilt thou sell this garment?

(ML, A), where it is *interrog.* (DM): (5) its *enuno.* does not occur as a single term (ML); but as a *prop.*,

as in the texts, contrary to ^{٥٦٤}كَمْ, as ^{٥٦٤}كَمْ رَجُلٌ قَائِمٌ ^{٥٦٤}How many a man is standing! (DM): (6) its *sp.* occurs only *sing.* (A). It has 5 *dial. vars.* [transmitted by Th (IY)], (1)

كَايِّن [the original and chastest one (IY, A), which is read by the Seven except Ibn Kathīr (A)] ; (2) كَاتِّن , upon the measure of كَاعِن , [the next best, which {is read by Ibn Kathīr, and (A)} is most frequent in poetry (IY, A), as in the 2 preceding verses and وَكَاتِّن بِالْأَبَاطِيحِ النَّحْ (166) (A)] ; (3) كَايِّن , upon the measure of كَعِين , [which is read by AlA'mash and Ibn Muḥaiṣin (A)] ; (4) كَيْتِن , upon the measure of كَيْعِن ; (5) كَان , upon the measure of كَعِن (M, A).

§ 227. كَيْت and ذَيْت are contracted from كَيْتَة and ذَيْتَة [689]. They are pronounced with Fath, Kasr (M, R, A), and Damm (M, R, Sn) of the ت , Fath being the best known (A). Pause upon them is [with the ت (R),] as in بُذِت (M, R) and اُخِت (M). They are used [by many of the Arabs (M)] according to the *o. f.* (M, R, A), as كَان مِنَ الْأَمْرِ كَيْتَة وَكَيْتَة (IY, A) : and then are pronounced only with Fath (R, A), because of the heaviness of the reduplication ; and are paused upon with the ة [646]. And AU transmits كَيْتَة with the ة pronounced with Fath and Kasr in place of the ت of

كَيْتُ [690]. They are *uninfl.*, because each of them is a word occurring in the place of the sentence, while the *prop.*, as such, is not entitled to either inflection or uninflectedness (R). They are always repeated (M, R, A) with the *con.* وَ, as كَيْتُ وَكَيْتُ قَالَ فُلَانٌ Such a one said so and so and كَيْتُ وَكَيْتُ كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ ذِيَّتُ ذِيَّتُ Such and such circumstances of the matter took place (R), in order that they may not be imagined to be *mets.* for single words (IY). It is a mistake to say قَالَ فُلَانٌ كَيْتُ because the Arabs say كَانَ مِنَ الْأَمْرِ كَيْتُ وَكَيْتُ because the Arabs say كَيْتُ وَكَيْتُ and قَالَ فُلَانٌ ذِيَّتُ وَذِيَّتُ, making كَيْتُ وَكَيْتُ a *met.* for deeds, and ذِيَّتُ وَذِيَّتُ for speech (D).

CHAPTER VI.

THE DUAL NOUN.

§ 228. Dualization is the addition of one *n.* to another like it (IY). The *du.* is that [*n.* (IY)] to whose final 2 augments, (1) an ة [in the *nom.* (IY)], or a ي [in the *acc.* and *gen.* (IY)] preceded by a letter pronounced with Fath, and (2) a و pronounced with Kasr, are affixed, in order that the 1st [*aug.* (IY)] may be a sign of the addition of *sing.* to *sing.*, [and a compensation for the suppressed *n.* (IY),] and the other may be a compensation for what is prevented [by the addition of another *n.* (IY)], vid. the vowel and Tanwīn existing in the *sing.* (M). The *o. f.* of the *du.* [and *pl.* (R)] is [said to be (R)] coupling (IY, R) with the و [539] (R). The *du.* is that [*n.* (YS)] which indicates *two* [*things* (YS)] and serves instead of 2 [*ns.*] coupled together, like ^{الزَّيْدَانِ} *The two Zaid's*, its *o. f.* being ^{زَيْدٌ وَزَيْدٌ} *Zaid and Zaid*, from which they deviate out of dislike to the prolixity and tautology (Fk). This is shown by the fact that the poet, when constrained, reverts to coupling (IY, R), which is frequent in poetry (IY) ; and that coupling sometimes occurs anomalously in prose (R) : and it is confirmed by the fact that you do not put the *du.*

in the case of different *ns.*, as جَانِي زَيْدٍ وَعَمْرُو , because one of the 2 expressions does not indicate the other (IY). But, when *multiplication* is intended, as

لَوْ عَدَّ قَبْرٍ وَقَبْرٍ كُنْتُ أَكْرَمَهُمْ * مَيْتًا وَابْعَدَهُمْ مِنْ مَنْزِلِ الذَّامِ
[by 'Iṣām Ibn 'Ubaid azZimmānī, *If grave and grave were reckoned, I should be the noblest of them when dead, and the farthest of them from the abode of blame* (T)], or the 2 *ns.* are separated by a separative either expressed,

جَانِي رَجُلٍ طَوِيلٍ وَرَجُلٍ قَصِيرٍ *A tall man and a short man came to me*, or supplied, as جَانِي رَجُلٍ فَكَرِمْتُ الرَّجُلَ , *A man came to me, and I honored the (coming) man and the man that thou didst beat*, i. e.

جَانِي الرَّجُلِ الْجَانِي , coupling is allowable, as you see, without anomaly or exigency. And, in order to denote *multiplication*, the *n.* is sometimes repeated without coupling, as

LXXXIX. 22. [132]; or dualized, as ثَمَّ ارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ كَرَّتَيْنِ ,

LXVII. 4. *Then repeat the gaze twice* and لَبَيْكَ [115]

(R). For every *n.* that is dualized 8 conditions are prescribed [234]:— (1) *sing.* number; (2) inflection; (3) absence of composition; (4) indeterminateness; (5) agreement in letter; (6) agreement in sense; (7) objective existence of a second to it; (8) that the place of its *du.* should not be supplied by the *du.* of another word (Fk), or rather by another word. The following *ns.*

therefore are not dualized:— (1) the *du.* and perfect *pl.* [232]; (2) the *uninfl.*, contrary to the opinion of Mb : (3) the *att. comp.*, by common consent [234]; and the synthetic, contrary to the opinion of the KK and their followers ; and the *n.* ending in ^أوَيْه, contrary to the opinion of some, which is adopted by Syt : (4) the proper name, while it retains its quality of proper name [171]: (5) *ns.* applied to denote what has no second in existence, like ^أشَمْسُ *sun* and ^أقَمَرٌ *moon*, when the proper [not tropical] signification is intended : (6) the trope and homonym with respect to their different significations : (7) such as ^أشَمْسٌ and ^أقَمَرٌ [above] ; but this condition can be dispensed with, its place being supplied by the condition of agreement in letter: (8) ^أبَعْضٌ, ^أسَرَّاءٌ, and ^أضَبَعَانٍ the name of the *male hyena*, because the place of their *du.* is supplied by the *du.* of ^أجَزْءٌ, ^أسَيِّ, and ^أضَبْعٌ the name of the *female*, though ^أسَرَّاءِي and ^أضَبَعَانِي are transmitted ; and the *nums.* other than ^أمِائَةٌ and ^أأَلْفٌ, contrary to the opinion of Akh, because the place of the *du.* of ^أثَلَاثَةٌ *Three* is supplied by ^أسِتَّةٌ *Six*; and ^أأَجْمَعٌ and ^أجَمْعًا, according to the opinion of the BB, because the place of their *du.* is supplied by ^أكُلٌّ and ^أكُلَّتْ (YS). But they say ^أأَبُو الْعَرَاءِ meaning *Abū Bakr and 'Umar*, and

القمران meaning *The sun and moon*, because here the matter is plain and free from dubiety. The *du.* is of 2 kinds, (1) that in which the letter of dualization is affixed to the *n.*, while the latter is constructively separate, as رَجُلَانِ [229], عَصَوَانِ, and all that precede; (2) that which is formed as a *du.*, but in which the *sing.* is not constructively separate, as مَنْرَوَانِ [229] and عَقْلَتَهُ بِنَائِيْنِ *I knee-halterd him with two ends of a rope* [230], neither مَنْرَوَانِ nor ثَنَائِيْنِ having a *sing.* (IY). When the *du.* is not that of an abbreviated *n.* [229], the form of the *sing.* remains in it preserved (M), as XX. 66. [525] and فَوَجَدَ فِيْهَا رَجُلَيْنِ يُقَاتِلَانِ XXVIII. 14. *And he found in it two men fighting together* (AAz). The *g* of feminization is elided (1) in [only 2 words (M),] خُصْيَانِ and أَلْيَانِ (M, IH), by analogy خُصْيَتَانِ and أَلْيَتَانِ (IY, R), which also are allowable, by common consent, as

بَلَى أَيْرَ الْحِمَارِ وَخُصْيَتَا * أَحَبُّ إِلَيَّ فَزَارَةً مِنْ فَزَارٍ

Yes, the penis of the he-ass and his 2 testicles are dearer to Fazāra than Fazāra or a Fazarā and مَتِيْمًا تَلْقَنِيَّ الْحَمَّ [74]; while خُصْيَانِ and أَلْيَانِ are said by some to be poetic licenses, because they do not occur except in poetry, as

كَانَ خَصِيْبَةً مِنْ التَّدْلِيلِ * ظَرْفٌ عَجُوزٌ فِيهِ ثَنَتَا حَنْظَلٍ

[by Khitām alMujāshir, quoting from a woman who said it of her husband (AAz), *As though his two testicles from dangling were an old woman's pot wherein were 2 colocynths*, properly حَنْظَلَتَانِ (IY, AAz),] and

طُعِينَةٌ وَاقِفَةٌ فِي الرِّكْبِ * يَرْتَجُّ الْيَاةُ ارْتِجَاجَ الرُّوْطِ

(M, R) He is a like a woman's camel-litter standing still among the camel-riders : his two buttocks quiver with the quivering of the milk-skin [85] : (2) sometimes in other

words, as وَنَحْرٌ آخٍ [532] (AAz). The ن of the *du.* is elided an account of (1) prothesis [110] (M, IH), as in the

saying of the Prophet الْحَسَنُ وَالْحُسَيْنُ سَيِّدَا شَبَابِ أَهْلِ الْجَنَّةِ *AlHasan and AlHusain are the two chiefs of the youth of the people of Paradise* (AAz); (2) poetic license

[233], as in هُمَا خَطَّتَا آخٍ [44]; (3) abridgment of the *conj.*,

as in الضَّارِبُ بَازِيْدٌ with the *acc.* [344] (R) : and its ا [also

is elided (IY)] because of meeting a quiescent, as in

جَاوَنِي غُلَامًا ابْنِكَ *The two menservants of thy son came to me* and (IY) [610, 653] (M).

§ 229. If the *decl. n.* be sound in the final or defective [16], the sign of the *du.* is affixed to it without

alteration, as رَجُلَانِ [228], جَارِيَتَانِ, and قَاضِيَانِ from رَجُلٌ, جَارِيَةٌ, and قَاضٍ (IA). The word is altered in the

du. in 3 sorts [of *n.*], the abbreviated [16], the prolonged [230], and the [*n.*] arbitrarily curtailed of its final [231] (R). The *l* of the abbreviated is either 3rd or upwards. If it be 3rd, then, (1) if an *o. f.* of it in the *و* or *ي* be known, it is restored to its *o. f.* in the *du.*,

عَصَوَانِ and فَتَيَانِ (M) from عَصَا and فَتًى (IY) : the poet says

رَقْدٌ أَعْدَدْتُ لِلْعَدَالِ عِنْدِي * عَصَا فِي رَأْسِهَا مَنَوَا حَدِيدٌ

And I have made ready, for the upbraidors beside me, a staff on whose head are two manè-weights of iron (A) ;

and the *Kur* has دَخَلَ مَعَهُ السَّجْنُ فَتَيَانِ XII. 36. *And two young men entered the prison with him* (IY, A) :

while جَمْرَانِ from حَمَى is anomalous (A), because its *l* is a substitute for a *ي* (Sn) : (2) if its *o. f.* be unknown,

then, (a) if it be pronounced with *Imāla*, it is converted into *ي*, as مَتَيَانِ and بَلَيَانِ from مَتًى and بَلًى [639]

when used as names ; (b) if not, it is converted into *و*, as لُدَوَانِ and الْوَانِ [686] from لَدًى and أَلًى when

used as names (M). As to the 2 *ls* that are not substituted [for a known *o. f.*, being either not substituted at

all, or substituted for an *o. f.* whose identity is unknown (Sn)], vid. the *rad.* **ا**, i. e. that which is in a *p.*, [as **بلى** (Sn),] or its like, [as **متى** (Sn),] and the **ا** whose *o. f.* is unknown, [which IUK exemplifies by such as **الذئ** *play*, because, says he, one does not know whether its **ا** be from a **ي** or **و** (Sn),] there are 3 [or rather 4 (Sn)] opinions:— (1) the well known one, that their state with respect to *Imāla* is regarded, so that, if pronounced with *Imāla*, they are dualized with the **ي**; and, if not, with the **و**; this is the opinion of S, and is decisively asserted by IM here : (2) that, if pronounced with *Imāla* or converted into **ي** in any position, they are dualized with the **ي**; and, if not, with the **و**; this opinion is preferred by IU, and is decisively asserted by IM in the *Kāfiya* : and, according to this, **على**, **ألى**, and **كلى** are dualized with the **ي**, because their **ا** is converted into **ف** with the *pron.* [129, 205]; while, according to the 1st, they are dualized with the **و**; both of which sayings are transmitted from Akh : (3) that the *rad.* and unknown **ا** are converted into **ي** unrestrictedly, [i. e. whether they be pronounced with *Imāla* or not, and whether they be converted into **ي** in any position or not : (4) that they are converted into **و**, whether they be pronounced with *Imāla* or not, as in the *Ham'* (Sn)]. The **ا** sometimes has 2 *o. fs.* with respect to 2 *dials.*, in

which case 2 modes are allowable, as رَحَى, which belongs to the *ی* in the *dial.* that says رَحِيْتُ, and to the *و* in the *dial.* that says رَحَوْتُ; so that the *du.* may be رَحِيَان and رَحَوَان, though the *ی* is more frequent (A). If, however, the *ل* be above the 3rd, it is converted into *ی* only, [because, when the abbreviated exceeds 3 letters, its *ل* is either converted from a *ی* or assimilated to what is converted from it (IY),] as مَرَمِيَان from مَرَمَى, where the *ل* is *orig.* converted from the *ی* (IY); مَلْهِيَان [from مَلْهَى, where the *ل* is converted from a *ی*, and the *ی* is a substitute for the *و* (685, 727) (IY)]; and حَبْلِيَان, حَبْرِيَان, [أَرْطِيَان], and قَبْعَثْرِيَان, from حَبْلَى (263), حَبْرَى (378), أَرْطَى (18, 497), and قَبْعَثْرَى (401), where the *ل* is not converted from any thing, but is in the predicament of what is converted from the *ی* (727), since the *و* does not occur as a final when 4th (or upwards) (IY)]. As for مَنْدَرَوَان [721], it is because the dualization in it is inseparable, like the femininization in شَقَاوَةٌ [266] (M), so that it has no *sing.* [228], as شَقَاوَةٌ has no *masc.* (IY): ‘Antara says

أَحُولِي تَنْفُضُ اسْتَكْ مَنْدَرَوِيهَا * لَتَقْتَلَنِي فَهِيَ أَنَا ذَا عَمَارَا

(Mb, IY), satirizing ‘Umāra Ibn Ziyād al‘Absī, *What!*

round me does thy rump shake its two buttocks, that thou mayst slay me? Then, mark, I am this hero [552], 'Umāra! (AAz) ; whereas, if it had a *sing.*, you would say مَنْرِيَان in the *du.* (Mb). This is the opinion of the BB about the abbreviated that exceeds 3 letters, whether its letters be few or many : but the KK relate that, when the abbreviated transcends 4 letters, and its letters are many, the Arabs elide its *l* in the *du.* (IY): قَهْقَرَان and خَوَزَلَان, with elision [of the *ي* (Sn)], in the *du.* of the *quin.* قَهْقَرِي and خَوَزَلِي are anomalous (A). In short, the *l* of the abbreviated is converted into (1) *ي* in 3 positions, (a) when it is 4th or upwards ; (b) when it is 3rd, a substitute for a *ي* ; (c) when it is 3rd, unknown in *o. f.* and pronounced with *Imāla* : (2) *و* in 2 positions, (a) when it is 3rd, a substitute for a *و* ; (b) when it is 3rd, unknown in *o. f.*, and not pronounced with *Imāla* (IA). The whole of the anomalies in the abbreviated one 3, (1) مَنْرَدَان : (2) خَوَزَلَان and قَهْقَرَان, which the KK hold to be regular : (3) رَضِيَان, which Ks holds to be regular ; so that he allows رَضِي and عَلِي, which belong to the *cat.* of the *و*, but are pronounced with *Kasr* or *Damm* of the 1st, to be dualized with the *ي* (A).

§ 230. The *ns.* whose final is a *Hamza* are of 2

kinds, prolonged and unprolonged. The prolonged [229] is every *n.* whose final is a Hamza preceded by an *aug.* ١, as كَسَاءٌ and رَدَاءٌ [683, 723] (IY). The Hamza of the prolonged is [of 4 kinds (R)], (1) substituted for the ١ of feminization, as حَمْرَاءٌ [263]; (2) denotative of co-ordination, as عَلِيَّاءُ [273]; (3) converted from a *rad.* [و or ي (R)], as كَسَاءٌ [and حَيَاءٌ (IA)]; (4) *rad.*, as قَرَاءٌ (R, IA). The Hamza [substituted for the ١ (IA, A)] of feminization is usually converted into و (R, IA, A), as حَمْرَآءٍ (IA, A): and is rarely sounded true, as حَمْرَآءٍ; or, [as Mb transmits from Mz (R),] converted into ي, as حَمْرَآئِ (R, A): but Sf asserts that, when its ١ is preceded by a و, as عَشَوَاءُ, the Hamza must be sounded true, as عَشَوَآءٍ, not عَشَوَآءٍ, in order that 2 و having only an ١ between them may not be combined; and the KK in that case allow both methods (A). The *rad.* Hamza is [usually (R)] preserved [in the *du.* (R, A), as قَرَأَآءٍ and رَضَآءٍ (IA, A); but F transmits from some of the Arabs that it is converted into و, as قَرَأَآءٍ (R)]. The Hamza denotative of coordination, or converted from a *rad.* [و or ي (R, A)], may be converted into و, [as عَلِيَّآءٍ, كَسَآءٍ and حَيَآءٍ (IA, A)]; or

preserved, [as ^{عَلْبَاوَانِ}, ^{كَسَاوَانِ}, and ^{حَيَاوَانِ} (IA, A)]; but conversion is better in the Hamza denotative of co-ordination, and preservation in the one converted from a *rad.* (R, IA, A): so IM mentions, agreeably with the opinion of some; but S and Akh, followed by Jz, declare that preservation is better unrestrictedly, though S mentions that conversion is more frequent in the Hamza denotative of coordination than in the one converted from a *rad.*, while it is rare in both (A). The Hamza [substituted for a *rad.* (R)] is sometimes converted into ^ي, [as ^{كَسَايَانِ} (A)]; though this is anomalous (R, A), contrary to the opinion of Ks: and they treat ^{ثَنَيَايَانِ} as sound [721], because they convert only the final ^و or ^ي into Hamza after the ^ا, as ^{كَسَاوَانِ} and ^{رَدَاوَانِ}; whereas here the ^ي is not final, since the *sing.* is not used [228]. The 2 *aug.* of femininization [273] (R), the ^ا and Hamza (A), when they follow 4 or more letters (R), are sometimes elided [together (A)], as ^{قَاصَعَانِ} [and ^{عَاشُورَانِ}, by analogy ^{قَاصَعَاوَانِ} and ^{عَاشُورَاوَانِ} (A), because of the length (R)]; though this is anomalous (R, A); contrary to the opinion of the KK (R). The anomalies in the prolonged are 5, (1) ^{حَمْرَاوَانِ}, which, as Ns relates, is allowed by the KK; (2) ^{حَمْرَايَانِ}, which, as some relate, is the *dial.* of Fazāra; (3) ^{قَاصَعَانِ}, which

is held by the KK to be regular ; (4) كَسَايَانِ, which is held by Ks to be regular, and is transmitted by AZ from the *dial.* of Fazāra ; (5) قَرَارَانِ, though the language of some GG implies that it has not been heard (A). The unprolonged is every *n.* whose final is a Hamza not preceded by an ا, as رَشَا, حِدَا, and قَارِي; and it admits of only one method, vid. retention of the Hamza, as رَشَانِ, because the Hamza in it is *rad.* (IY).

§ 231. As for the *n.* [arbitrarily (R)] curtailed of its final, [it is of 2 kinds (IY) :—] (1) if the elided [ل] (IY) be restored in prothesis, as in أَب [16], اَخ, [حَم, and هَن (R),] it must be restored in the *du.* [also (R)], as أَبَوَانِ, أَخَوَانِ (IY, R), حَمَوَانِ, and هَنَوَانِ : (a) sometimes أَبَانِ and أَخَانِ are said (R) : (b) he that says هَنَك in prothesis says هَنَانِ in the *du.*, and he that says هَنُوك says هَنَوَانِ (IY) : (c) as for فُوك, the ل is not restored in the *du.*, as it is not restored in prothesis ; and the word is dualized only by conversion of its ل into م, as when it is not *pre.*, as فَمَانِ : but فَمَوَانِ occurs in poetry, as

هُمَا نَقْتَانِي فِي مَنْ فَمَرِيهَما * عَلَى النَّابِغِ الْعَارِي أَشَدَّ رِجَامِ

[by AlFarazdaq, *They two have spat into my mouth from their two mouths* (233) a most severe reviling against the barker, the howler (Dw)]; and فَعْيَانِ, which is stranger : (d) the ل of ذَات is restored in the *du.*, not the ل of ذُر, as ذَوَاتَا مَال; but ذَاتَا مَال also occurs, though it is rare (R) : (2) if the [elided (IY)] ل be not restored in prothesis, as in [عُد (R),] يَد, and دَم, it is not restored in the *du.* [also (R)], as يَدَانِ and دَمَانِ : (a) as for [يَدَيَانِ in (R)] the saying of the poet

يَدَيَانِ بِيضَاوَانِ عِنْدَ مُحَلِّمٍ * قَدْ تَمْنَعَانِكَ أَنْ تَضَامَ وَتَضَهَدَا

[*Two noble hands belonging to Muḥallim (a king of Al Yaman) do hinder thee from being wronged and oppressed* (AAz), it is explained by our school as rare and anomalous, and is held by them to be a poetic license ; but, in my opinion (IY)], it is according to the *dial.* of those who say يَدِي, [treating it as abbreviated (IY),] like رَحِي : (b) [similarly دَم is used abbreviated, so that (IY)] [or دَمَوَانِ (R)] is said, as in the saying of the poet [Mirdās Ibn ‘Amr, or, as is said AlAḫḫal (IY), or Suḥaim Ibn Wathīl arRiyāḥī (N),]

فَلَوْ أَنَا عَلَى حَجَرٍ ذُبَحْنَا * جَرَى الدَّمِيَانِ بِالْخَبْرِ الْيَقِينِ

(IY, R) *So that, if we were slaughtered on a single stone, the 2 bloods would flow apart with the certain tidings of enmity and hate* (IY): Jh says that its ل is a د, so that دَمِيَان is anomalous according to him ; but Mb says that its ل is a ي, so that دَمَوَان is anomalous according to him. But, as for the n. whose ل is elided for a necessitating cause, it is either abbreviated or defective [229] (R).

§ 232. The [*quasi-pl.*, or the broken, not being an ultimate (R),] *pl.* [228] is [allowed to be (R)] dualized according to the interpretation of [*two collections* or (M)] *two parties* : the poet says

لَنَا اِبْلَانٍ فِيهِمَا مَا عَلِمْتُمْ * فَعَنْ اِيْهَا مَا شِئْتُمْ فَتَنْكَبُوا

[*We have two herds of camels, wherein is what ye have known for the entertainment of guests. Then, from whichever of them ye will, shoulder what ye will, carrying it to your tents* (N), cited by AZ ; and in tradition

is {the saying of the Prophet (IY)} مَثَلُ الْمَنَاقِقِ كَالشَّاةِ

مَثَلُ الْمَنَاقِقِ كَالشَّاةِ The similitude of the hypocrite is like the sheep going to and fro between the two flocks (M)] ; and the poet ['Amr Ibn Al'Addá (AAz)] says

لَا صَبَحَ الْحَيُّ اَوْبَادًا وَلَمْ يَجِدُوا * عِنْدَ التَّفَرُّقِ فِي الْهَيْجَا جَمَالِيْنِ

(M, R) By God (N), the tribe would have become destitute, and would not have found upon dispersing in war 2 herds of he-camels (AAz, N), so that it might sup-

port the burden of warlike expeditions (N), cited by AUd; and they say لِقَاحَانِ سَوْدَاوَانِ *Two herds of black milch-camels*, [quoted by S (IY)]; and Abu-nNajm [al'Ijlī (Jsh)] says, [describing a mare trained to war (N),]

تَبَقَّلْتُ فِي أَوَّلِ التَّبَقُّلِ * بَيْنَ رِمَاحِي مَالِكٍ وَنَهْشَلِ

(M) *She grazed in the beginning of the grazing between the two clumps of spears of Mālik Ibn Dubai'a and Nahshal Ibn Dārim, 2 Chiefs of the Arabs (N).* This is easier in اِبْلَانِ, because اِبْلٌ, being a generic *n.*, is *sing.* [254], not a broken *pl.*, like جَمَالِ (IY). But لَنَا مَسَاجِدَانِ is not allowed.

§ 233. When 2 parts are *pre.* in letter or sense to their 2 wholes, then, if the 2 wholes be uniform in letter, the *sing.* number in the *pre.* is better than the *du.*, as

كَانَتْ وَجْهَ تَرْكِييْنِ قَدْ غَضِبَا

As though it were the face of 2 Turks, who had become angry and حَيَا اللَّهُ وَجْهًا لِلزَّيْدَيْنِ *God save a face of the 2 Zaid's!*, in the latter of which the prothesis is in sense; and the *pl.* is better than the *sing.*, as اِنْ تَتَوْبَا اِلَى اللَّهِ *ان* LXVI. 4. *If ye turn again unto God, your hearts have swerved*, [an address to Hafsa

and 'A'isha (K, B)]. That is because in *lit.* prothesis, which is frequently used, they dislike the combination of 2 *du.* united in letter by the prothesis, and in sense, since the intention is that the *pre.* should be part of the *post.*, while no ambiguity is produced by the omission of dualization ; and *id.* [prothesis] is made to accord with the *lit.* : but, if the omission lead to ambiguity, only the *du.* is allowable according to the KK, which is the truth [below], as you say

قَلَعَتْ عَيْنَيْهِمَا *I plucked out their two eyes*, when you have plucked out an eye from each one ; while قَطَعُوا *they cut*

أَيْدِيَهُمَا V. 42. *Cut off their hands* means أَيْمَانَهُمَا *their right hands* by tradition and common consent, and is so read by Ibn Mas'ūd, [for which reason the *pl.* may be put in place of the *du.*, as in LXVI. 4., because the dualization of the *post.* is deemed sufficient (B)]. And the *pl.* is preferred to the *sing.* because of its affinity to the *du.* in being an addition of a *sing.* to another thing [234]. S makes no distinction between the first's being

single in each of the two [seconds], as in قُلُوبَهُمَا, and its not being so, as in أَيْدِيَهُمَا, relying upon the evidence of

V. 42. ; but the truth is what the KK hold [above], vid. that the *pl.* in the like of it is not allowable except with a plain indication, as in the text. The 2 idioms are combined in the saying [of Khitām alMujāshirī, says S, or Himyān Ibn Kuḥāfa, says F (FA),]

وَمَهْمَيْنِ قَدَفَيْنِ مَرَّتَيْنِ * ظَهَرَاهُمَا مِثْلَ ظَهْرِ التَّرْسَيْنِ

جِئْتَهُمَا بِالْغَيْتِ لَا بِالْغَيْتَيْنِ

[And many two deserts distant, bare of vegetation, whose 2 backs were like the backs of 2 bucklers, have I come to by the single description, not by the two descriptions!, i. e. have I traversed by hearing that road described a single

time! (AAz, N); and the o. f. is used in هُمَا نَفْثَا النَّخ (231)

(AAz)]. If, however, the 2 wholes be separated by a

con., the sing. is preferred to the du. and pl., as نَفْسُ زَيْدٍ

وَعَمْرٍو The person of Zaid and 'Amr, in order that the ap-

parent pre. may agree [in number] with the apparent post.: and, if the pre. be not part of the post., but they be separate, then, if there be danger of ambiguity, as in

لَقِيتُ غُلَامَيِ الزَّيْدَيْنِ I met the 2 menservants of the 2 Zaid's,

the pre. must be in the du.; whereas, if there be no danger, it may be regularly in the pl., agreeably with the opinion of Fr and Y, contrary to the opinion of others,

who allow it as matter of hearsay, as in ضَعُّ رِحَالَهُمَا

Put down their saddles, where there is no danger of ambiguity, because 2 camels have only 2 saddles. In the pron. relating to every n. that we have mentioned, whose letter differs from its sense, the letter or sense

may be observed, as نَفُوسُكُمَا اعْجَبَتَانِي or اعْجَبَتَانِي The

persons of you two pleased me ; and similarly in the *qual.*, *dem.*, and the like (R). The *sing.* sometimes occurs in the place of (1) the *du.* (R, BS), in the case of those 2 things which accompany one another and do not separate, like the two legs and two eyes, as عَيْنِي لَا تَنَامُ Mine eye sleeps not (R), whence

أَلَا إِنَّ عَيْنًا لَّمْ تَجِدْ يَوْمَ وَاسِطٍ * عَلَيْكَ بِجَارِي دُمُعَهَا لَجَمُودٌ

(BS), by Abū 'Atá asSindī, lamenting Ibn Hubaira, Now, verily an eye that lavished not its flowing tears over thee, O Ibn Hubaira, on the day of thy death at Wāsīt, was indeed niggardly (FD) ; and approximate to it is

وَعَيْنَايَ فِي رَوْضٍ مِنَ الْحُسْنِ تَرْتَعُ

And my two eyes revel in gardens of beauty, [for تَرْتَعَانِ]:

(2) the *pl.*, [when there is no danger of ambiguity (K on II. 6),] as وَيَكُونُونَ عَلَيْهِمْ ضِدًّا XIX. 85. And they shall be adversaries to them, whence

كُلُوا فِي بَعْضِ بَطْنِكُمْ تَعَفُّوا * فَإِنَّ زَمَانَكُمْ زَمَنٌ خَمِصٌ

[316] (R) Eat ye in part of your bellies : [if ye eat little (AAz),] ye will be abstinent. For verily your time is a hungry time (AAz, N), i. e. بَطُونُكُمْ (SL), and الْوَارِدُونَ

[18] with جُلْدٌ in the *sing.* (N). Conversely the *du.* acts as a substitute for the *sing.*, as

فَجَعَلُوا مَدْفَعًا عَاقِلَيْنِ أَيَاْمَنَا * وَجَعَلُوا امْعَزَ رَامَتَيْنِ شِمَالًا

Then they put the watercourse of 'Akil on the rights, and put the hard ground of Rāmatān on the left, i. e.

عَاقِلٌ; which is a mountain; and Fr allows وَلَمْ يَخَفْ

LV. 46. And he that feareth the bar of

his Lord shall have a garden to be an instance of this;

and IKhz states in the Nihāya [fi-nNahw (HKh)] that

they say مَاتَ حَتْفًا أَنْفِيًّا He died [a natural death, li-

terally] the death of his nose, [orig. He died upon his bed, and his soul came forth from his nose (Md),] and that

يَا حَبَّذَا عَيْنَا سُلَيْمَى وَالْفَمَا

O most lovely are the two eyes of Sulaimā and the mouth

is an instance of this construction, the o. f. being وَالْفَمَانِ,

and the فِ elided by poetic license [228] (BS): and اِفْعَلًا

sometimes acts as a substitute for اِفْعَلٌ, as L. 23. [193],

either because dualization of the ag. is made a substitute for repetition of the v., as XXIII. 101. [598, 607] is

explained; or because most travelling-companions are 3 in number, and each of them usually addresses his 2

companions, so that a single person also is addressed as two, because their tongues are accustomed to it (R). The

pl. sometimes occurs in the place of the [sing. or (R)]

du. (R, BS), a synecdoche being meant to be understood, as ^{قَطَعَ اللّٰهُ خَصَلَةً} ^{جَبَّ مَذَاكِيرَهُ} *He cut off his penis* and *God cut off his testicles !* (R) ; and the substitution of the *sing.* and *pl.* for the *du.* are combined in the saying of the Hudhali [Abù Dhu'aib (N)]

^{فَاَلْعَيْنَ بَعْدَهُمْ كَانِ} ^{حَدَاتُهَا * سَمَلَتْ بِشَوْكِ} ^{فَهِيَ عَوْرُ تَدْمَعُ}
Then the eye after the death of them is as though its
blacks were put out with thorns, so that they are blind,
shedding tears (BS).

P. 456, l. 8. Read "cp."

P. 461, l. 7. This Khālid was the cousin of Abū Dhu'aib (Is, Jsh).

P. 464, l. 3. The majority, however, hold that ^{ألف}مهم is curtailed, being constructively ^{ألف}مهم: and that afterwards the ʾ is interpolated, without being reckoned [as the ʾ of femininization (Sn)]; and is pronounced with Fath, because it occurs in the place of what requires Fath, vid. what precedes the ʾ of femininization elided, but understood (A)—
l. 4. By AlḤuṭai'n (IY).

P. 465, l. 20. It is named *subst.* in the conventional language of the BB: and, as for the KK, Akh says that they name it *interpretation* [of what is meant by the *ant.* (Sn)], and *explanation* [of it (Sn)]; while IK says that they name it *repetition* (A) of what is meant by the *ant.*; but the propriety of these 3 names is not evident in the case of the *subst.* distinct [from the *ant.*] (Sn).

P. 468, l. 17. Because the enunciative *prop.* would remain without a *rel.* (IY).

P. 469, ll. 6-7. By AlAkḥṭal (Akh).

P. 470, l. 11. Cited by Mz (MAd).

P. 471, l. 18. After "Zaid" insert "[160]".

P. 472, l. 7. ^{ألف}إيالة relates to ^{ألف}أخوك, being the *cop.* [27], according to R's theory as to the *op.* of the *subst.* [131].

P. 473, l. 5. He satirized AlḤajjāj (T)—l. 10. A heathen poet (FA).

P. 474, l. 1. Read "Ḳuraish".

P. 476, l. 11. Read "Sa'id".

P. 478, l. 17. ^{ألف}العطف in lexicology is *Reversion to the thing after departure from it* (Sn)—l. 18. This *appos.* is named ^{ألف}عطف البيان because the speaker *reverts* to, and *manifests*, the *ant.* by means of it (Sn).

P. 479, l. 2. The Khalifa Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar Ibn AlKhaṭṭāb alKuraishī al'Adawī alMadanī, a. 13, l. 23 (Nw).

P. 480, l. 1. But here the *synd. expl.* is not a *prim.*

P. 481, l. 13. Bishr Ibn 'Amr, of the Banū Bakr Ibn Wā'il (AAz).

P. 486, l. 1. كَفَرُوا بِعُضَى is governed in the *acc.* by an understood *v.* indicated by كَفَرُوا, as though he said كَفَرُوا بِعُضَى (T).

P. 489, l. 2. For "his" read "His"—l. 3. Read "because (MAIH)]".

P. 492, l. 14. Maslama Ibn Dhuhl, Zayyāba being his mother (Jsh), one of the Banū Taim Allāh Ibn Tha'laba (Iath), a heathen poet—l. 15. AlḤarith Ibn Hammām ashShaibānī (T, Jsh).

P. 494, l. 17. Read "Umar".

P. 499, l. 18. R adds "being a verbal *n.*" to the preventives of inflection in order to account for the uninflectedness of those verbal *ns.* which resemble the *aor.* (see p. 653, l. 7—p. 654, l. 1).

P. 501, ll. 18-20. That the verbal *ns.* are *uninfl.* is not disputed, though three different reasons are given at pp. 653-654 for their being so. The validity of the reason here given, vid. that they resemble the *p.* in not being impressible by the *op.*, is based upon the theory that they have no place in inflection, i.e. do not occupy the place of a *n.* in any case, which is disputed (see p. 658).

P. 503, l. 7. Some of the BB, according to R (see p. 743, l. 19)—l. 16. Abū Ṣakhr 'Abd Allāh Ibn Salīm asSahmī alHudhālī, an Islāmī poet of the Umawī dynasty (AKB). The Banū Sahm were his tribe (T)—l. 19. By Mirbāl Ibn Jahm alMadhhijī (MN, FA, Jsh) or Mubashshir Ibn AlHudhail alFazārī (MN).

P. 506, l. 2. On the name "*met.*" see p. 823, ll. 9-10.

P. 508, l. 4. خَلِيلِي [with reduplication (Jsh) of the final ي] is the [perf. masc.] pl. [of خَلِيل (EC)] pra. to the ي of the 1st per. sing. (EC, Jsh).

P. 510, l. 1. The 2nd hemistich is given in *IY.* 10 and 84 as

وهذه أتى من دونها النأي والبعد

And Hind, farness and distance have come in front of her, i.e., between me and her—l. 15. Or, as is said, his son Sawāda Ibn ‘Adī (AKB).

P. 517, l. 20. ^{٤٨}الطبا is abbreviated (MN, FA, N), by poetic license (FA, N), because its o. f. is ^{٤٨}الطبا with the Hamza (MN).

P. 518, l. 8. For “XXVIII” and “611” read “XXVII” and “612”.

P. 521, l. 8. حميداً Humaid or حميداً praiseworthy. The verse is attributed to Humaid Ibn Huraith Ibn Baḥdal [alKalbī (I^Ath)], of the Banū Kalb Ibn Wabra, whose pedigree reaches to Ḳuḍā’a. Humaid was an Islāmī poet; and Maisūn Bint Baḥdal, the mother of Yazīd Ibn Mu’āwiya, was his paternal aunt (AKB). حميد (IY. 414).

P. 523, l. 3. I.e. فبيها هو. The verse is by AlMukhallab alHilālī, of whose pedigree and history I know nothing; and has been plagiarized by Al‘Ujair asSalālī alHilālī, a freedman of the Banū Hilāl, whose name was ‘Umais Ibn ‘Abd Allāh, a minor Islāmī poet of the Umawī dynasty. Sgh says “The piece is Lāmīya; but نجيب occurs in the Book of S in place of ذلول tractable, and the GG have followed him in the mistranscription” (AKB)—l. 7. Hamdān is a tribe of AlYaman (AKB).

P. 531, ll. 17-18. An elegant, excellent poet of the Umawī dynasty (AKB). ‘Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān asked him for his daughter in marriage for one of his sons (Mb). The Khalīfa ‘Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān [alKurashī alUmawī, b. 26 (ITB), a. 65 (MDh), d. 86 (MDh, ITB). He was proclaimed Khalīfa in succession to his father Marwān Ibn AlḤakam after ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair had laid claim to the Khilāfa; and his undisputed Khilāfa, i. e. after the slaughter of ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair, was from the middle of 73 (ITB). The Khalīfa Marwān Ibn AlḤakam alKurashī alUmawī, [nephew and (Nw, ITB)

private (TKh)] secretary of 'Uthmān [Ibn 'Affān (Nw, ITB), b. 2, (Nw), a 64 (ITB, TKH)], d. 65 (Nw, ITB, TKH). Ibn AzZubair was proclaimed Khalifa (AGh, Is, TKh) at Makka (TKh) in 64 (Is, TKh) in the days of Yazid Ibn Mu'āwiya (TKh), [or] after the death of Yazid (AGh, Is) Ibn Mu'āwiya (Is); or in 64 or 65 after the death of Mu'āwiya Ibn Yazid (TKh).

P. 534, l. 4. ^{وَالشَّرَّ} ^{إِيَّكَ} as an *ex.* of detachment caused by suppression of the *op.* is appropriate only when the *op.* is supplied before the *pron.*; for, when the *op.* is supplied after the *pron.*, it is an *ex.* of detachment caused by precedence of the *pron.* before its *op.* (see l. 19 and the Note on p. 196, l. 18).

P. 535, l. 3. Abū Bakr aṣṢiddīq said to the Apostle of God (God bless him and give him peace!) "Teach me a supplication wherewith I may supplicate [God] in my prayer." He said, Say ^{اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي ظَلَمْتُ}

^{نَفْسِي ظُلْمًا ثَقِيرًا وَلَا يَغْفِرُ الذُّنُوبَ إِلَّا أَنْتَ فَاعْفِرْ لِي مَغْفِرَةً مِنْ عِنْدِكَ}
^{وَارْحَمْنِي} أَنْتَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ O God, verily I have done much

wrong against mine own soul; and not (any) forgiveth sins but Thou. Wherefore forgive Thou me of Thy grace, and have mercy upon me. Verily Thou, Thou art the very forgiving, the Merciful (SB. I. 214)—l. 9.

Properly ^{نَفْسًا} [446] (AKB)—l. 10. He was named Dhu-l-Iṣba' because a serpent bit his *finger* (ID, AKB), so that it withered away. He is said to have lived 270 years; and AHm says that he lived 300 years. And he was one of the judges of the Arabs in heathenism (AKB). The question of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān "Who is he?" in Tr. II. 815 and I Ath. IV. 270 (see the Note on p. 44, l. 11), to which Ma'bad Ibn Khālid alJadali answered "He is Dhu-l-Iṣba'", did not refer to the man put forward by 'Adwān as their spokesman with the Khalifa, but to the author of the verses quoted by 'Abd AlMalik, as is clear from the *var.* "Who says this?" in Tr. II. 815, note k, and AKB, II. 409. Cf.

KA. III. 3—l. 11. Bk says (AKB), Qurra is a place in the countries of the Banu-l-Harith (Bk, AKB) Ibn Ka'b (AKB).

P. 542, l. 19. A heathen [poet (FA, AKB)], lamenting his brother Uṭait, and complaining of two companions of his, who were harassing him, said to be his two nephews Mudrik and Murra (MN, FA, AKB): so says Al'Aini (AKB).

P. 543, ll. 19—20. Attributed by the commentators of the Book of S to 'Umar Ibn Abi Rabi'a; but by [AFI,] the author of the KA, who is followed by [Jb,] the author of the Ṣiḥāḥ, to Al'Arji (AKB)—ll. 23-24. The author of *عَدَدْتُ قَوْمِي* is [not Ibn Duraid, but] Ru'ba (MN, FA, EC, AKB) Ibn Al'Ajjāj (MN).

P. 544, l. 4. He said that of a man who was mentioned to him as intending to do him harm (IY).

P. 545, l. 10. The Persian *ed.* of the ML (p. 253, l. 16) has *لَتَسْكُنَ*; but the 2 Egyptian *eds.*, the DM (vol. II., p. 279) and Amr (vol. II., p. 223), have the form given in the text.

P. 546, ll. 20-22. These are the annullers of iſchoation [24] The *vs.* of *app.* are omitted, because their *pred.* is an *aor. v.* [459]; and the generic *neg.* *لَا*, because its *sub.* and *pred.* are *indet.* [100].

P. 549, ll. 13-14. Muḥammad Ibn Marwān [Ibn AlḤakam, brother of the Khalifa 'Abd AlMalik (IATH, ITB)], one of the Readers of AlMadīna, [d. 101 (IATH) or 102 (ITB)]. IAl says "Ibn Marwān wraps himself up in his solecism", i.e. by making the distinctive occur between the *d. s.* and *s. s.* (R)—l. 15. Zaid Ibn 'Alī [Zain al'Ābidīn (ITB)] Ibn alḤusain Ibn 'Alī Ibn Abi Ṭalib alḤashimī [alMadani, d. 80 (IHjr)], k. [121 (IKb, MDh, MAB, TKb), 122 (IKb, MDh, IATH, MAB, IHjr, ITB), or] 123 at the age of [42 (MAB) or] 44 (FW).

P. 555, l. 10. Ibn Abi-l'Āṣ athThakāfi alBaṣrī, the celebrated poet, reproving his cousin 'Abd ArRaḥmān Ibn 'Uthmān Ibn Abi-l'Āṣ (AKB).

P. 556, l. 2. D. 84 (Ia, IHjr, AKB): d. 89 (ITB).

P. 557, l. 9. By Ṣakhr Ibn AlJa'd alMuḥārībī alKhudrī, an elegant poet contemporary with the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid dynasties (KA). The forms العود or العبود and الخضرمي in the MN. II. 227, FA. 95, SM. 197, and Jsh, seem to be erroneous—l. 10. Ṣakhr Ibn AlJa'd was enamoured of Ka's, daughter of Bujair Ibn Jundab (KA); not, as Lane supposes (p. 2049, col. 1), "of El-Kelḥabeh El-'Orance".

P. 559, l. 5. Shadan is a place in AlYaman (Bk).

P. 561, l. 7. Zaid Ibn Muḥalhil atṬā'ir anNabhānī, known as Zaid AlKhail, who came to the Prophet with the embassy from Tayyī in the year 9, and was named by the Prophet Zaid AlKhair. He was a good poet. On his departure from the Prophet, he was seized with fever; and, when he reached his family, he died; but some say that he died at the end of the Khilāfa of 'Umar (AGh)—l. 16. Kais is the father of a tribe of Muḍar (AKB, J) called Kais 'Ailān, a prothetic comp., [meaning *The Kais of 'Ailān*] (AKB)—l. 19. Ḥumaid Ibn Malīk.....Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm, an Islāmī poet of the Umayyad dynasty, contemporary with AlḤajjāj. He was named AlArkaṭ [*The spotted or speckled*] because of some marks that were on his face (AKB). Jh says the verse is by Ḥumaid (MN, FA); but IY says (MN, FA, AKB) it is by Abū Baḥdala (IY, MN, FA, AKB), whom I do not know (AKB).

P. 562, ll. See an *ex.* of the 2nd prevailing over the 3rd in p. 125, ll. 14-16.

P. 575, l. 3. Ka'b Ibn Sa'd alGhanawī, an Islāmī poet, and apparently a Follower (AKB)—l. 19. Lane's assertion that هَا is not prefixed to the *du.* of ذَاكَ (p. 947, col. 3) is refuted by what IY says here; and his assertion that هَا is not prefixed to أُولَئِكَ (p. 947, col. 3), and that one does not say هُوَئِكَ or the like (p. 86, col. 3), is refuted by the verse at l. 15 and by Al'Arjī's verse at p. 564, where the *dim.* of هُوَئِكَ appears.

P. 576, ll. 12-14. هَا has 3 *dial. vars.*, هَا, هَا, and هَا (IY. 337). They are all of one sense, vid. demonstration of *place*; but they differ

in nearness and distance, the near places being demonstrated by ^{قرب} with Damm, and the distant by the '2 others (MN, FA)—l. 21. Read ^{أرجائها} and "on its," the pron. referring to the ^{بها} trackless waste mentioned in the verse preceding.

P. 580, l. 6. This verse is cited by Skr. in the DH as (AKB) by a man of Hudhail (DH; AKB). It belongs to the same poem as the lines cited in vol. II, p. 717, ll. 11-12 and in the Note thereon at p. 29A. Numerous *vars.* of this verse and of the verses cited in p. 579, ll. 16-17 and p. 580, l. 3 are given in the AKB. Read ^{تربى}—l. 10. The Lucknow ed. of the R gives ^{لا تعرف}; but the Teheran ed. has ^{لا تعرف} is not charmed, which seems more appropriate. The Delhi ed. gives no vowels—ll. 23-24. According to R, ^{أى} is made *det.* by its expressed or constructive prefixion to a *det.*, not by its *conj.* (p. 586, ll. 13-15).

P. 582, l. 13. Al'Alni says (AKB) it is by AlAkhtal (MN, FA, AKB); but I have searched diligently through his *Diwān* without finding it (AKB). This poet was given the cognomen of AlAkhtal because of the bigness of his ears (MN, FA): [but various other reasons are stated in the KA and AKB]. He was a Christian (KA, FA), of the people of AlHira (KA); and he belongs to the 1st class of Islāmi poets (KA, MN, FA). He lived a long life until he went to Hell-fire (AKB)—l. 1. The saying of the Banū 'Ukail or Hudhail ^{جاء اللذين قاموا} They that stood came (BS).

P. 583, l. 2. Its author is Ru'ba Ibn Al'Ajjaj: but is said by AZ and IAr to be a heathen man of the Banū 'Ukail; though they differ about his name, which AZ says is Abū Ḥarb AlA'lam, while IAr says something else. And Sgh says that the author is Lailā alAkhyaliya (MN).

P. 583, l. 20. ^{مكان} with Tanwīn from regard to its being a name of a ^{مكان} place (AKB). Either form suits the metre—ll. The verse is by Umayya Ibn AlAskar, or, as is said by [ID and] the author of the

KA, Ibn Ḥurthān Ibn AlAskar [or AlAshkar (AGh, Is)], alKinānī [al-Laithi alJundā'i (AGh, Is)], a converted poet (AKB).

P. 584, l. 1. 'Ukāz, Majanna, and Dhu-lMajāz were markets for Makka in the time of heathenism. 'Ukāz is a level plain. AU says (Bk), 'Ukāzis between Nakhla and Aṭṭā'if (Bk, ZJ, MI), one night's journey from Aṭṭā'if and 3 from Makka (MI). It was taken as a market 15 years after [the year of] the Elephant, [in which the Apostle of God was born (SR, Tr, LM),] and was abandoned for ever in the year 129 (Bk). The market of 'Ukāz used to open on [the morning of (Bk)] the 1st of Dhu-lḲi'da, and last 20 days (Bk, ZJ)—II. By a man of [the Banū (MN, FA)] Sulaim (MN, FA, EC).

P. 585, l. 20. Coptic by origin, freedman of the family of AzZubair Ibn Al'Awwām, b. 115 [or 120 (HH)], d. 197 (Syt).

P. 587, l. 9. Kais Ibn Jirwa (ID, T, AKB), a heathen poet (AKB), named 'Āriḳ because of this verse (T, AKB)—l. 15. An Islāmi poet of the Marwāni dynasty (AKB)—l. 20. Whence

قَوْلًا لِهَذَا الْمَرْءِ ذُو جَاءٍ سَاعِيًا * هَلَمْ فَإِنَّ الْمَشْرِفِي الْفَرَائِضِ

(R), by Kawwāl aṭṭā'i (T, AKB), an Islāmi poet, who lived at the end of the Umawī, and reached the 'Abbāsi dynasty, *Say ye two to this man, who has come collecting the poor-rate, Come on; for verily the sword* (called ^{المشرفي} in relation to the Mashārif, which were certain towns where swords used to be forged) is with us instead of the camels fit to be taken in payment of the poor-rate (AKB). The Mashārif were near Ḥaurān: Buṣṣā was one of them (MI).

P. 588, ll. 18-19. Then he [the Fazārī mentioned in the story told in the Note to p. 845, l. 18] said to one of them, whose name was Mirḳama "Eat of it"; but he refused. Then he smote him, and cut off his head. Then said the other "Mirḳama has perished!" Then said the Fazārī ^{وَأَنْتَ أَنْ لَمْ تَلْقَمَهُ} *And thou if thou swallow it not!* IHb says "He

فَإِنْ أَدْعِ آلَ لَرَاتِي مِنْ أَنْاسٍ • أَضَاعُوهُنَّ لَا أَدْعِ الَّذِينَ

(R), by AlKumait Ibn Zaid, satirizing Kaḥṭān, i.e. the tribes of AlYa-t man, *Then, if I spare to satirize those women (that) are of, i.e. dependen upon, men that have neglected, i.e. have not protected, them, I will not spare those men (that have neglected them), the conj. of آلَ لَرَاتِي being مِنْ أَنْاسٍ, i.e. مِنْ أَنْاسٍ, while the conj. of الَّذِينَ is suppressed, because indicated by the previous mention of it [in أَضَاعُوهُنَّ ep. of أَنْاسٍ, which is part of the preceding conj.], the full phrase being الَّذِينَ أَضَاعُوهُنَّ (AKB), and*

مِنْ آلَ لَرَاتِي وَالَّتِي دَالَّتِي • زَعَمُنَّ أَنِّي كَبُرْتُ لِدَاتِي

(R) *From those women (that have asserted etc.), and (from) that woman (that has asserted etc.), and (from) those women that have asserted that I, verily my contemporaries have grown old, the conj. of the first two conjuncts being suppressed, because indicated by the conj. of the third (AKB)—l. 7. Addressing Imra alḲais Ibn Ḥujr alKindī (Jsh)—l. 17. ISh says, وَالَّتِي and دَالَّتِي are made fem. here because الدَّاعِيَةُ calamity is fem. (AKB). They are [proper (Md)] names for [Great and Small (T)] Calamity, and therefore dispense with the conj., [and are transferred from being conjuncts (T),] as*

وَلَقَدْ رَأَيْتُ نَائِي الْعَشِيرَةِ بَيْنَهَا • وَكَفَيْتُ جَانِبَيْهَا اللَّتَا وَالَّتِي

(T, Md), by Sulmī [or Salmā (AKB)] Ibn Rabī'a [asSīdī (AKB)], of the Banu-sSīd [Ibn Mālik Ibn Bakr Ibn Sa'd (AKB)] Ibn Ḍabba (T, AKB), a heathen poet, *And assuredly I have reconciled the discord of the community among themselves, and have sufficed its wrong-doer against the great and small calamity that he has brought upon himself (AKB); but some say that their conj. are suppressed, because indicated by [the circumstances of] the case (T).*

P. 605, l. 1. By Al'Uryān Ibn Sahla alJarmī, a heathen poet. This verse is one of three verses cited by AZ in his *Nawādir*; but his version is not like that of the majority (AKB). The other two verses are the 1st and 4th of the poem by Al'Uryān cited at p. 712 of the T and p. 181 of the Calcutta ed. of the *Ḥamāsa*, where the unmeaning words ^{لَسَهْلَةٌ} ^{وَدَمٌ} after ^{بَنَ سَهْلَةَ الْجَرْمِيِّ} seem to be a mistranscription for ^{وَقَالَ الْعَرِيَانُ} ^{غَيْرُهُ}. This verse, which is the 3rd in AZ's version, is not given in either ed. of the *Ḥamāsa*—l. 5. F says that ^{الَّذِي} here may signify (1) *the Ka'ba*, being made *masc.* as meaning ^{الْبَيْتَ} *the House*, in which case the [acc.] *pron.* in ^{حَجَّ} is suppressed, because this *v.* is *trans.*, as is shown by the text ^{فَمَنْ حَجَّ الْبَيْتَ أَوْ اعْتَمَرَ} II. 153. *Then whoso performeth the pilgrimage to the House, or visiteth it*; and the sense is ^{الَّذِي حَجَّهُ حَاتِمٌ} *that (which) Ḥatīm has performed the pilgrimage to*: (2) *God*, in which case the full phrase is ^{الَّذِي حَجَّ لَهُ حَاتِمٌ} *Him (that) Ḥatīm has performed the pilgrimage (for the sake of)*. But IJ says on

^{وَدَيْقُ إِنِّي وَمَا حَجَّ الْحَجَّيْجَ لَهُ * وَمَا أَهْلُ بَجْنَى نَخْلَةَ الْحَرَمِ}

[by Ziyād Ibn Ḥamal, or Ibn Munqidh, one of the Bal 'Adawīya, of the Banū Tamīm (T)], *Ruwaiḡa*, verily I, I swear by that House which the pilgrims perform the pilgrimage to, or by that House (which) the pilgrims perform the pilgrimage to for the sake of obedience to Him, i.e. God, and by the raising of the shout ^{لُبَيْكُ} [115] on the two sides of Nakhla, [a place near the city of the Prophet (II) (T),] by the enterers into the Sacred territory, the 2nd ^{مَا} being infinitival, that, when the 1st ^{مَا} is held to be an expression for *the House*, the *s* in ^{لَهُ} may denote (1) *the House*, ^{لَهُ} being i.q. ^{إِلَيْهِ}, as in XCIX. 5. [504], i.e. ^{إِلَيْهَا}, [as though he said ^{أَنَسَمُ} (T)]; (2) *God*, i.e. ^{يَا لُبَيْتَ اللَّهِ حَجَّ إِلَيْهِ الْحَجَّاجُ وَبَاهِلُ الْحَرَمِ} [i.e. ^{حَجَّهُ}]. Thus it is known that R's language is [derived from] one of F's 2 explanations, ^{الَّذِي} being con-

strued to signify *God* (AKB). But, if so, R would supply ^{لَهُ} instead of ^{إِلَيْهِ} : and I think that he construes ^{إِلَٰهِي} to signify *the House*, but supplies ^{إِلَٰهِي} in accordance with the construction ^{حَجَّ إِلَى الْبَيْتِ} allowed by IJ and T—*l. l.* Ya'sur or A'sur was father of a tribe, that Bāhila belonged to (MN). See p. 27A.

P. 616, *l.* 22. The Banū Khalaf were AzZibriḳān's kinsfolk, Khalaf being his great-grandfather, because he was AzZibriḳān Ibn Badr Ibn Imra alḲais Ibn Khalaf.....Ibn Sa'd Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm (AKB).

P. 617, *l.* 10. Hudba was an elegant superior poet from the desert of AlḤijāz (AKB). He had killed Ziyāda Ibn Zaid al'Udhri; and, when he was carried to Mu'āwiya, 'Abd ArRaḥmān, brother of Ziyāda Ibn Zaid, advanced with him, and prosecuted him. Then said Mu'āwiya to him, "What sayest thou?" He said "Likest thou that the answer be in poetry or prose?" He said "Nay, in poetry; for verily it is pleasanter." Then said Hudba (Mb). Here follow some verses, of which this is one.

P. 618, *l.* 6. Praising AlJarrah Ibn 'Abd Allāh [alḤakamī (IATH, ITB)], Governor of Khurāsān. He was Commander of AlBagra, and afterwards became Governor of Armenia. He penetrated into the lands of the Khazar, and was martyred there (Dw) in 112 (IATH, ITB)—*ll.* 14-15. Ḳaṣīr Ibn Sa'd (ID, IATH, KF) of Lakhm (ID, IATH) Ibn 'Adī (ID). See Md. II. 123 and P. II. 450.

P. 621, *l.* 18. Māwiya is one of the names of women, among them Māwiya, the wife of Ḥatīm of Ṭayyi; and this verse is similar to his poetry, but I have not known it attributed to him (AKB). It is not in his *Dīwān* as given in the FDw.

P. 622, *l.* 18. Ḥatīm Ibn 'Abd Allāh aṭṬa'i, celebrated for his munificence, and one of the poets of heathenism (AKB).

P. 623, *l.* 16. And ^{فِي} ^{رَمَادٍ} is transmitted (ML). This verse is part of a *Dāliya* ode by Ḥassān Ibn Thābit (MN, AKB) al Anṣarī (MN) aṣṢalābī: but its rhyme has been perverted by IJ, who transmist

فِي دَمَانٍ; and he is followed by many, among them IHsh in the ML, who says "And دَمَان is like مَدَان in measure and meaning" (AKB)—
 l. 17. Ibn Dirār, cousin and contemporary of Zaid alFawāris Ibn Ḥuḡain Ibn Dirār aḍḌabbi (T. 279), who was a heathen (AKB)—l. 18. Ath says that Ḥassān composed this poem upon Rufai' Ibn Ṣāifi Ibn 'Ābid, who was killed as an unbeliever on the day of Badr (AKB) in the year 2 (Tr, LM, TKh)—l. 23. The poets called AlKumait are 3 of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima, (1) AlKumait alAkbar Ibn Tha'laba..... Ibn Jaḥwān Ibn Faḳ'as [Ibn Ṭarīf.....Ibn AlḤārith Ibn Tha'laba Ibn Dūdān Ibn Asad Ibn Khuzaima alAsadī, a Convert, says AU, as AlMarzubāni mentions (Is)]; (2) AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn AlKumait alAkbar [alFaḳ'asī, a Convert, says AlMarzubāni (Is)]; (3) AlKumait Ibn Zaid.....Ibn Sa'd Ibn Tha'laba Ibn Dūdān Ibn Asad (AKB), a poet of the Umawī dynasty, *d.* 122 (Is) [or] 126 (ITB). The verses at p. 616 of vol. II. and pp. 297 and 367 of this vol. are all from one ode by AlKumait Ibn Zaid alAsadī (MN. III. 111); and the verse at p. 112 of this vol. is by the same poet (MN. I. 534): while the verses at pp. 623 and 712 of vol. II. are by AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf (MN. IV. 109, 320, Jsh); though IAr says that the last verse is by AlKumait Ibn Tha'laba alFaḳ'asī (MN. IV. 321).

P. 624, l. 20. D. [104 (Nw),] 105 (IKb, IATH, IKhn, Nw, TH), 106 (IKhn, Nw, TH), 107 (IKhn, Nw, TH, IHjr, TKb), 108 (ITB), or 115 (IKhn), at the age of 80 (IKb, IKhn) or 84 (IKhn)—l. 23. D. 156 (IHjr). Not [to be confounded with 'Isā Ibn 'Umar] athThaḳaḳī, the Baṣri Grammarian, who also is one of the leading Readers (DM).

P. 625, l. 3. The last word is الْقَتْلُ *speech*, which Dm has mis-spelt الْقَتْلُ *slaughter*. The verse is from an ode composed by Ka'b Ibn Mālik, poet of the Apostle of God, in answer to 3 pieces that Ibn AzZibārā and 'Amr Ibn Al'Āṣ had glorified themselves with on the day of Uḥud (AKB) in the year 3 (Tr, IATH, LM). Ka'b Ibn Mālik [aṣṢaḥābī (Nw)] alAnṣārī (AGh, Nw, AKB) alKhazrajī asSalāmī (AGh, Nw), of the Banū Salima (AGh) Ibn Sa'd (IHb, Dh) Ibn 'Alī.....Ibn AlKhazraj (IHb),

one of the poets of the Apostle of God (AGh, AKB), *d.* 50 or 53 (Nw, AKB) at the age of 77 (AKB). The Prophet's poets were Ḥassān Ibn Thābit, Ka'b Ibn Mālik, and 'Abd Allāh Ibn Rawāḥa (AGh). See SR, pp. 623-625 for the ode. Read ^{لَقِيلُ}—ll. 5-6. For "then.....(DM)" read "then for what does speech abound? (AKB)"—l. 12. Insert "knew" before "that"—l. 13. Or conjunct, *knew that which my Lord hath forgiven me* (K, B). The ب depends upon ^{فَقُلْ} if مَ be *interrog.*, and upon ^{يَعْلَمُونَ} if مَ be infinitival or conjunct (B).

P. 629, l. 1. Suwaid Ibn Abī Kahil [‘Uṭāif or (Is, AKB)] Shabīb alYashkurī, a converted poet (KA, Is, AKB), who lived some time in heathenism, and [for 60 years after the *Hijra* (AKB)] in AlIslām until the time of AlḤajjāj (Is, AKB) : so in the Is (AKB).

P. 631, l. 5. AlKuraṣhī alAsadī (Nw, Is) alMadanī aṣṢaḥābī (Nw), *k.* [treacherously (Is)] on the day of the Camel, in the year 36, at the age of (IKb, Nw, Is) 60 (IKb), 64 (IKb, Nw), 66, or 67 (Nw, Is), by [‘Amr (Is)] Ibn Jurmūz (IKb, Is), a man of the Banū Tamīm (Is).

P. 636, l. 2. ^{جَوَزَ} may be in the *gen.*, governed by ^{رَبِّ}, understood after ^{بَلْ}; or in the *acc.*, coupled to ^{دَارًا} (AAz). On the form ^{أَلْحَقَفْتُ} see § 646.

P. 637, l. 2. Shumair, so spelt by AZ, or Sumair, so spelt by Akh and Sgh, Ibn AlḤārith aḍḌabbī, a heathen poet, author of the verse ^{فَإِنَّ} [153] (AKB)—l. 3. This is one of 4 verses transmitted by AZ, and attributed by him to Shumair Ibn AlḤārith aḍḌabbī, or, as Akh says, Sumair (AKB). [The next verse is cited in *vol. II*, p. 296.] It is also transmitted, with the version ^{عَمْرًا مَبْنَحًا} *May your life be pleasant at morn !*, as part of a poem rhyming in ح; and is then attributed [without dispute (N)] to Jidh' Ibn Sinān alḤassānī (N, AKB), a heathen poet (AKB). The poem rhyming in م is also attributed to Ta'abbāṭa Sharra (N).

P. 639, ll. 8-9. See the 2nd explanation in the Note on p. 169, l. 17, where the qualified, when treated as compounded with the *quāṭ* into one *n*, is considered to be *uninfl.* upon Fath, not *infl.* in the *acc.*, as R hero says.

P. 640, l. 7. The disconnection is produced by the repetition of ^أن, which makes a fresh *prop.*

P. 643, l. 15. Naṣr Ibn Sayyār, governor of Khurāsān (Jsh).

P. 644, l. 13. R supplies a *post. n.* in imitation (see p. 647, l. 21).

P. 645, l. 21. By Ghassān Ibn ‘Ula (MN, FA, J, Jsh) Ibn Murra (MN, Jsh) Ibn ‘Ubād (MN). Murra Ibn ‘Ubād was of Kais Ibn Tha‘laba (IKb). [There was a poet named] Ghassān Ibn Wa‘la, one of the Banū Murra Ibn ‘Ubād (T). [The name of] the author of this verse has not reached me: IAMB says “AASH transmits it with Ḍamm of ^أم ^أش” “on the authority of Ghassān, who is one of those on whose authority the classical language is derived from the Arabs”; so that Ghassān is the author of the verse: but IHsh asserts that it is by a man of Ghassān; and God knows best! (AKB).

P. 646, l. 3. Hārūn Ibn Mūsā [al‘Azdī al‘Atakī, their freedman (IHjr), a Jew, who afterwards become a Muslim (IKb, NA),] al‘awar [the one-eyed], the [Baṣrī Grammarian and (NA, IHjr)] Reader (IKb, NA, IHjr). He transmitted readings from IIU (IKbn). The Follower (Nw, ITB) Ṭalḥa Ibn Muṣarrif [alYāmī (Nw, IHjr), oralYāmī (Nw), alHamdāni (Nw, ITB)], the Kufī Reader, *d.* [110 (Nw),] 112 (IKb, Nw, IHjr, ITB), or 113 (Nw). Yām or Iyām is a clan of Hamdān (LL)—l. 4. After “alHarrā” insert “the master of Fr.” This is MIM.

P. 651, l. 1. This is one of the 50 verses of S whose authors are not known: but is asserted by Al‘Ainī, who is followed by Syt in the SM, to be part of an ode by AlMuthakḳīb al‘Abdī; whereas there is no foundation for this (AKB). It is by Suhaim Ibn Wathīl arRiyāḥī (MN, FA, N), from the same ode as ^{أَنَا ابْنُ جَلَّالٍ} [149] (N)—l. 2. An ancient heathen poet, contemporary with ‘Amr Ibn Hind: so says IKb

(AKB). His name, [as IKb says, was Miḥṣan Ibn Tha'laba; but, as Iamb says (AKB),] was 'Ā'idh Ibn Miḥṣan (ID, MN, Nw, AKB) Ibn Tha'laba (MN, AKB).

P. 652, l. 10. The *ps.* are superfluous to the attribution—l. 19. The 'Aḳīk [pl. A'ikḳa (KF)] is every channel [of water (MI)] that [the water of (KF)] the torrent has cloven (MI, KF) in the earth, and then enlarged and widened. The lands of the Arabs contain many A'ikḳa; and the mention of the 'Aḳīk in poetry is frequent (MI).

P. 653, l. 3. By Laḳīṭ Ibn Zurāra (AKB), *l.* on the day of Jabala (SR, ID).

P. 654, l. l. See p. 659, l. 15.

P. 655, ll. 4-6. This is the opinion of IH (p. 652, ll. 2-3) and R (ll. 8-9 below).

P. 656, l. 13. Read "197".

P. 657, l. 10. فُطِّل (Th, IY, KF, MAd) or فُطِّل (Th, KF) or فُطِّل (MAd).

P. 660, ll. 3-4. This is one of 7 verses by 'Antara, the author of the Mu'allaka [see Abl. 35]; and is also transmitted as by Khuzaz Ibn Laudhān as Sadāsī. Both of them were heathens. 'Antara addressed these verses to his wife, who ceased not to mention his horses, and to reproach him about a steed which he used to prefer above the rest of his horses, and to which he used to give milk to drink (AKB)—l. 5.

العنيق is a name for *dates*, a proper name (AKB). For "*wine*" read "*dates*".

P. 661, l. 3. أَرَصَتْ (R) : رَصَتْ (K. 1071). الْقَرَطِطُ pl. of الْقَرَطِطُ (N), which is Persian (Jk), arabicized (Jk, KF) from كَرْتَه (KF): الْقَرَطِطُ (K, R), pl. of قَرَطُف, like جَعْفَرُ, which is a قُطَيْفَةٌ, i. e. *garment having a nap*. This verse is from an ode by Mu'akḳir Ibn Aus alAzdi alBārīkī, [a heathen poet (ID),] praising the Banū Numair, and

mentioning what they did to the Banū Dhubyān at the Pass of Jabala, where a battle took place between the Banū Dhubyān and the Banū 'Āmir, in which the Banū 'Āmir were victorious. Numair was the progenitor of a tribe of Kais, vid. Numair Ibn 'Āmir Ibn Ša'sa'a ; and Mu'aqqir was a confederate of theirs. The day of Jabala was 59 years before Islām, and 19 years before the birth of the Prophet, [who began his Mission at the age of 40 (SR, Tr, LM)]: so in the KA by AFI (AKB). Jabala was a [huge (Bk)] red mountain in Najd (Bk, MI)—ll. 4-5. He says *Many a Dhubyānī woman was there that bade her sons take plenty of these two things as booty*, if they should overcome their enemies; and that because of their neediness, and the fewness of their goods (AKB). MDE, who says that she *enjoined her sons to take care of the coats, etc.*, seems to have misunderstood the verse, probably from not knowing the occasion; but this is strange, because the K has "as though he said, *that bade them take them as booty*".

P. 662, l. 5. The word "mostly" is a reservation of such as كَذَّبَ.

P. 665, ll. 22—23. Umm Sālim was his beloved (AKB).

P. 668, ll. Dele the full stop after "Th".

P. 670, l. 10. Lane (p. 1350, col. 1), citing the KF as his authority, says "The word سُرْعَانٌ is used as a simple enunciative [placed before "its inchoative], and also as an enunciative denoting wonder": but this rendering of the KF involves serious errors, because (1) it gives سُرْعَانٌ a place in inflection, vid. that of a *nom.* as an *enunc.*, whereas the majority of GG hold that the verbal *n.* has no place in inflection; while those who give it the place of a *nom.* make it an *inch.*, not an *enunc.* (p. 658 above): (2) if it were an *enunc.*, it would not be placed before its *inch.*, because, since, like other verbal *ns.*, it governs an *ag.* (p. 661), the *post-pos. inch.* would be taken for an *ag.*; so that سُرْعَانٌ كَذَا, like سُرْعَانٌ قَامَ زَيْدٌ, would not be allowable as *enunc.* and *inch.* (p. 111). The words of the KF are سُرْعَانٌ يَسْتَعْمَلُ خَبْرًا مَعْصُومًا وَخَبْرًا فِيهِ

مَعْنَى السَّرْعِ And سَرْعَان is used as a simple enunciation, [i. e. *Quick* is] ; and as an enunciation containing the sense of wonder, [i. e. *How quick is!*] : خَبْرًا meaning enunciation, the *correl.* of command ; not *enunc.*, the *correl.* of *inch.*

P. 672, l. 19. I. e. AlFaḍl Ibn Ḳudāma (ID, KA, SM, AKB), who contended with Al'Ajjāj in reciting poetry of the Rajaz metre, and was contemporary with [the Khalifa (Nw, ITB)] Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik (AKB) alḲurashī alUmayy adDimashqī (ITB), b. 72 (Nw), a. 105, d. 125 (Nw, ITB).

P. 673, l. 2. By Zaid Ibn 'Amr Ibn Nufail alḲurashī al'Adawī, d. 5 years before the Mission : but attributed to his son Sa'īd Ibn Zaid [asṢahābī (Nw)], d. 50 or 51 or 52, at the age of 70 and odd, or of 73, years ; and to Nubaih Ibn AlḤajjāj. Nubaih and his brother Munabbih were chiefs [of the Banū Sahrn (ID)] of Ḳuraish ; and were killed, [with Al'Ās son of Munabbih (SR),] on the day of Badr as unbelievers (AKB) —l. 20. The Khalifa Sulaimān Ibn 'Abd AlMalik [alUmayy (ITB), b. 60 (FW, TKh)], a. 96, d. 99 (MDh, FW, ITB, TKh) at the age of [39 (MDh),] 45 (MDh, ITB), or 53 (MDh).

P. 674, ll. 6-7. The verbal and *inf. ns.* may both be said to act as substitutes for the *v.* ; but with the latter the *v.* is, and with the former it is not, supplied—l. 11. Of Khunā'a Ibn Sa'd Ibn Hudhail (DH)—l. 15. 'Alī Ibn Mas'ūd alAzdi [alGhassānī (Tr, IATH)] was brother of 'Abd Manāt Ibn Kināna on the side of his mother [Fukaiha Bint Hanī (Tr, IATH)] ; and, when 'Abd Manāt died, he brought up 'Abd Manāt's children, whose origin was therefore traced to him (DH), so that the Banū 'Abd Manāt were called Banū 'Alī (Tr, IATH).

P. 675, l. 3. سِر Journey thou (R)—l. 5. سِر Journey ye (R)—ll. 17-19. It is sometimes *pre.* to the *ag.*, as رَوَيْدَكَ زَيْدًا [161, 187, 560].

P. 676, l. 6. يَغِب (T) : يَغِب (Md). يَغِب is in the *ind.*, the *prop.* being supposed to be anacoluthic and in *ceptvei* [423], an answer to

an assumed question "Why should I leave it alone?" [1]; and ^{يُغِبُّ} is in the *apoc.*, as *correl.* of the command, there being no ف [421]. Lane (p. 2221, col. 2) apparently considers ^{يُغِبُّ} to be in the *subj.*: for he says "^{حَتَّى} being understood, according to the explanation of Meyd", i. e. Md; while the *apoc.* does not occur after ^{حَتَّى} [414]. But Md's words ^{أَيُّ دَعَا حَتَّى تَأْتِيَ عَلَيْهِ أَيَّامٌ فَتَنْظُرُ كَيْفَ خَاتَمَتَهُ أَيْحَسَدُ أَمْ يَذُمَّ} i. e. *Leave it alone until etc.* (see the next Note) are an explanation of the sense, not of the syntax; for the *subj.* is not governed by ^{حَتَّى} [410], but by ^{أَنْ} necessarily understood after it [411, 413, 501]; while the *subj.* governed by ^{أَنْ} understood after ^{حَتَّى} understood is a thing unheard of. Moreover, even with the ف, the *subj.* does not occur in the *correl.* of the requisitive verbal *n.* [187, 411, 421]: and, without the ف, the *subj.* is impossible after a requisitive *v.* [420], such instances as ^{مَرَّةً} being anomalous, not to be taken as precedents [418. A]; and much more then after a requisitive verbal *n.*—l. 7. ^{عَبَّ عِنْدَنَا} *He remained a night with us*, i. q. ^{بَلَّتْ}, like ^{أَغَبَّ}; and hence their saying ^{رَوَيْدُ الشَّعْرِ يُغِيبُ} (KF), i. e. *Leave it alone until some days pass over it, so that thou mayst see how its end will be, whether it will be praised or blamed*: or it may mean *Leave the poetry alone: it will keep back from the people*, from ^{غَبَّتِ الْحُمَى} *The fever intermitted, when it keeps back for a day*, i. e. *Repeat not thy poetry to them incessantly, so that they weary of it* (Md). See Md. I. 253 and P. I. 522.

P. 677, l. 5. ^{يَسْمَعُ} (IY. 507): ^{تَسْمَعُ} (IY. 511).

P. 680, l. 11. ^{هَابٌ} (DA. 117, D. 140).

P. 683, l. 4. Muzāhim Ibn AlĤārith, or, as the author of the KA considers more correct, Ibn 'Amr Ibn Murra Ibn AlĤārith, al'Uḡailī, of the Banū 'Uḡail Ibn Ka'b Ibn Rabi'a Ibn 'Amir Ibn Ṣa'sa'a, an ele-

gant Islāmi poet of the desert, contemporary with Jarīr and AlFarazdaq (AKB)—*l.* 10. Ḥarmala Ibn AlMundhir, or, as is said (KA, Is), AlMundhir Ibn Ḥarmala, [the former being correct (KA),] atṬā'i, a Christian poet [in the beginning of AlIslām (AKB)], who is said to have lived 150 years (KA, Is, AKB), and remained till the days of Mu'āwiya (Is, AKB).

P. 684, *l.* 3. He was one of the one-eyed men of Kais, who were 5 poets, Tamīm Ibn Ubayy Ibn Muḳbil, ArRā'i, AshShammākh, Ibn Aḥmar, and Ḥumaid Ibn Thaur. ISh says that he was one of the poets of heathenism, and reached AlIslām: and IHjr says in the Is (AKB), AlMarzubānī says that he was a Convert, and died in the time of 'Uthmān after having attained a great age; but AFI says that he was one of the renowned poets of heathenism, and afterwards became a Muslim, and praised the Khalīfas that he met, *vid.* 'Umar and his successors down to 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān, which is contrary to the saying of AlMarzubānī, that he died in the time of 'Uthman (Is, AKB): and God knows! (Is)—*ll.* 16-18. What shows it to be a verbal *n.* is the saying of Ibn Harma

يَمْشِي الْقَطُوفُ إِذَا غَنَى الْحَدَادَةُ بِهِ * مَشَى الْجَوَادُ فَبَلَهُ الْجَلَّةُ النَّجْبَا

[*The slow (beast) steps out, when the drivers sing to him, with the step of the fleet (courser): let alone the full-grown, high-bred (camels)!*, for they, with singing, go faster than others (AKB)], because here it puts what follows it into the *acc.*: whereas in the saying of the other, [Abū Zubaid atṬā'i anNaṣrānī (AKB),]

مَنْ يَبْلُغُ تَوْمَنَا الْكَثَائِينَ إِذْ شَحَطُوا * أَنْ الْفَوَادَ إِلَيْهِمْ شَيْقُ رُبْعِ
حَمَالٌ أَتَقَالَ أَهْلَ الْوَدِ أَوْنَةً * اعْطُوهُمْ الْجَهْدَ مَنَى بَلَهُ مَا أَسْعِ

[*Who will convey to our distant people, since they have gone far away, that the heart is yearning for them, eagerly longing? (It is) the carrier of the loads of the people of the, i. e., my, love at (many) times. I give them*

the utmost effort of me : let alone what I can easily compass, the rel. being suppressed, i.e. ^{أسع} (AKB)], ^{مَا} may be in the position of an *acc.*, ^{بَلَّ} containing a *pron.* in the *nom.*, [i.e. ^{قَدَعَ} ^{الْوَسْعَ} (AKB)], as is shown by ^{بَلَّ} ^{الْجَلَّةَ} ^{النَّجْبَا} [above]; or in the position of a *gen.*, according to him that recites ^{بَلَّ} ^{الْكَفَ} [below], making ^{بَلَّ} an *inf. n.* (IY), i.e. ^{قَرَّكَ} ^{زَيْدٍ} [or ^{قَرَّكَ} ^{الْوَسْعَ}, like ^{زَيْدٍ}]; or [in the position of a *nom.* as an *inch.*, ^{بَلَّ} being i.q. ^{كَيْفَ}, because] the sense may be ^{كَيْفَ} ^{الْوَسْعَ} ^{لَا} ^{أَعْطِيَهُ} (Then) how is what I can easily compass, (that I give it not)? (AKB)—ll. 18—21. F says, What confirms its being an *inf. n.* is that AASh transmits ^{مَا} ^{بَلَّهَكَ} ^{لَا} ^{تَفْعَلُ} ^{كَذَا} What is the matter with thee that thou dost not such a thing?, i.e. ^{مَا} ^{لَكَ} What ails thee? (AKB). Lane (p. 254, col. 2) has ^{مَا} ^{بَلَّهَكَ}; and so apparently has the KF (p. 910), though here the vowel-mark is blurred; and the AKB does not give the vowel: but, since ^{بَلَّ} is *infl.* when an *inf. n.*, Damm seems necessary.

P. 685, l. 8. In the year 5 (SR, Tr, LM)—l. 9. See the ode in SR. 705-706—l. 17 and l. 21. Jahn (IY. 513) prints ^{مِنْ} ^{بَلَّ} and ^{مِنْ} ^{بَلَّ}; but, ^{بَلَّ} being *uninfl.* when i.q. ^{كَيْفَ}, Fatha, as in ^{مِنْ} ^{أَيْنَ}, seems correct; and is said to be so in the tradition (p. 686, ll. 12-14). See, however, the Note on p. 686, ll. 14-15—l. 22. The SB. III. 309, followed by the K and B, gives this tradition in the exposition of the text ^{لَا} ^{تَعْلَمُ} ^{نَفْسُ} ^{مَا} ^{أَخْفَى} ^{لَهُمْ} ^{مِنْ} ^{قِرَّةِ} ^{أَعْيُنٍ} XXXII. 17. Then not a soul shall know what delight of eyes hath been hidden for them, not of the ^{أَلَمَ}; so that Lane is wrong in inserting "[by these three letters]" after "God says" (p. 686, l. 1).

P. 686, l. 3. ^{بَلَّ} [without ^{مِنْ}] (SB, K, B); [and so in the *Sahih* of Muslim:] but ^{بَلَّ} ^{مِنْ} occurs in most of the MSS of the SB; and IHjr

says that, according to Sgh, the MSS of the SB agree upon ^أمِّنْ ^أبَلَّةٍ (AKB). ^أأَظْلَعْتُمْ ^أأَظْلَعْتُمْ ye have been acquainted with (SB): ^أأَظْلَعْتُمْ ^أأَظْلَعْتُمْ (K, B, KF); and so in l. 22 below—ll. 7-10. Shm says, In the version with the *gen.* ^أبَلَّةٍ may be an *inf. n.*, i.q. ^أالتَّوَكَّلَ, and ^أمِّنْ causative, i.e. *on account of their abandoning what ye have become acquainted with*, vid. *sins*; and in this case it is not excluded from the preceding [meanings] (Amr, DM). The *prep.* and *gen.* have been interpreted by the phrase "It is as though He said, *Let alone what ye have become acquainted with*; (*for it is easy by the side of what has been treasured up for them*)": but this is appropriate only to the exposition of ^أبَلَّةٍ not preceded by ^أمِّنْ; whereas, when it is preceded by ^أمِّنْ, it is said to be i.q. ^أكَيْفَ, ^أأَجَلَ [not ^أأَجَلَ, as in the KF], ^أسَوَى, ^أغَيْرَ, and ^أفَضْلَ (AKB). The ^أمِّنْ in this version, as explained by IHsh, seems to be *expl.*, as in XXXII. 17. (Note on p. 685, l. 22)—ll. 14-15. The Kasra of ^أبَلَّةٍ may be a Kasra of uninflectedness, which is corroborated by what AH says in the Ir, vid. that Fath and Kasr of the *s* have been heard in ^أبَلَّةٍ (AKB)—l. 15. ^أالنَّصَبَ in DM. I. 168, l. 23 appears to be a mistake for ^أالْفَتْحَ —l. 22. This is a piece of a tradition, vid. "God says, ^أأَعَدَدْتُ لِعِبَادِي ^أأَعَدَدْتُ [above]" (AKB).

P. 687, l. 8. The poet says

تَرَاكِبًا مِّنْ إِبِلٍ تَرَاكِبًا • أَمَا تَرَى الْكَيْلَ لَدَى أَوْدَاكِبَا

(IY) *Leave them, namely camels* (the *acc. pron.* being expounded by the *sp.* governed in the *gen.* by the *expl.* ^أمِّنْ, because the *pron.* is not preceded by what it relates to), *leave them. Dost thou not see the horsemen at their haunches?* This was the saying of Tufail Ibn Yazid alḤarīthī, a heathen poet and horseman, when Kinda had made a raid upon his

camels. He came up with them, saying *تَرَاكُمَا أَلَحَّ*, or, in another version, *دَرَاكُمَا مِنْ أَيْلٍ دَرَاكُمَا أَلَحَّ* *Overtake them, etc.*; and, bearing down upon the stallion of the camels, hamstrung him, whereupon the camels circled round him: then the Banu-Ḥārith Ibn Ka'b, coming up with Tufail, rescued his herd, while Kinda were put to flight (AKB). *الْخَيْلُ*

(IY): *دَعَمَتْ الْمَوْتَ* death (Mb. 269, AKB. II. 354). The fighting occurs at the hinder parts of the camels, because the raiders drive them, and urge them on; while the owners hinder them from that (AKB).

P. 688, l. 3. By Abu-nNajm al'Ijlī, an Islāmi Rājiz (AKB).

P. 689, l. 15. R has followed the author of the *Ṣiḥāḥ* in his relating the verse thus. It is compounded of 2 verses: for the verse containing *دُعِمَتْ نَزَالٌ*, which is by Zuhair Ibn Abi Sulmā, has for its 1st hemistich

وَلَنِعْمَ حَشْوُ الدَّرْعِ أَنْتَ إِذَا

And assuredly most excellent is the padding, i.e. wearer, of the coat of mail, thou, when; while *وَلَأَنْتَ أَشْجَعُ أَلَحَّ* is the 1st hemistich of a verse by AlMusayyab Ibn 'Alas, the 2nd hemistich of which is

يَقْعُ الصَّرَاخُ وَلَجٍ فِي الدَّعْرِ

the cry for help occurs, and etc. The latter verse, which is from an ode praising Kais Ibn Ma'dikarib alKindī, who died in heathenism, whence [80] *نُصِفَ النَّهَارُ أَلَحَّ*, is attributed by As to AlMusayyab Ibn 'Alas alJumā'i, who was maternal uncle of AlA'shā Maimūn, and was a heathen poet, who did not reach AlIslām; but by AU, ID, and others to his sister's son AlA'shā Maimūn (AKB).

P. 690, l. 20. An admirable minor heathen poet (AKB).

P. 691, ll. 6-7. AtTaimī, a heathen poet, retorting upon Laḳīṭ Ibn Zurāra atTamīmī, who had satirized 'Adī and Taim. He upbraids

Laḳiṭ with having fled in a battle where his brother Ma'bad Ibn Zurāra had been taken prisoner; and attributes his flight to greediness for food and drink (AKB)—l. 15. See the ode in SR. 723—l. 16. In the year 6 (LM)—ll. 19-20. Because the form of the *inf. n.* is not that of the *d.s.*, which is really an *ep.* [76] (IY. 241).

P. 692, ll. 20-21. See Md. II. 164 and P. II. 547, III. 285.

P. 693, ll. 5-10. See the Note on p. 38, ll. 3-4; and see p. 698, ll. 10-18—l. 21. Read "أَطْرَفُ الْخِ [497]".

P. 694, l. 15. Mb does not say "used in the *non-voc.*"; but implies these words by the form of his *exs.*, جَعَارِ يَا قَتَى and حَلَاتِي يَا قَتَى, the *voc.* phrase قَتَى يَا قَتَى being added to show that جَعَارِ and حَلَاتِي are not *vocs.* themselves.

P. 695, l. 16. Ibn Ja'far Ibn Kilāb (SR). He was a heathen (IATH. I. 416).

P. 696, l. 15. The reference is to p. 691, l. 5—l. 16. R cites this hemistich to show that بَدَا is a *fem. ep.* made to deviate from مَبْدُوءَةٌ, i.e. مَبْدُوءَةٌ; but this is contrary to the saying of S, who cites it to show that بَدَا is made to deviate from a *fem. inf. n.*, not from an *ep.*; and بَدَا occurs also as an *imp. verbal n.*: so that, according to this, بَدَا is of 3 kinds (AKB): but R's explanation obviously fails when بَدَا occurs as a *d.s.* to a *masc.*, as in the verse of Ḥassān at p. 691; whereas S's explanation, which is adopted by IY, applies in the case of both genders.

P. 697, l. 1. Sajāḥ Bint AlḤārith [Ibn Suwaid (MDh, IATH)] at Tamīmīya, [of the Banū Yarbū' (IKb),] who set up as a Prophetess in the Apostacy, and was followed by some people [of the Banū Tamīm (IKb)]. She afterwards made peace with Musailima, and married him; but, after his death, she returned to Al-Islām. She lived till the Khilāfa of Mu'āwiya (Is)—l. 2. Musailima [Ibn Ḥabīb (SR, IKb) alḤanaḥī (SR) of the Banū 'Adī Ibn Ḥanīfa Ibn Lujaim (IKb)], the Impostor of

AlYamāma, k. 11 (MDh)—ll. 5-6. See Md. I. 161, P. I. 32c—l. 17 King of AlḤira, commonly called AlMundhir Ibn Mā asSamā after his mother Māwīya Bint 'Auf Ibn Jusham, who received the cognomen of Mā asSamā [*Water of Heaven*] on account of her beauty (AF)—l. 14. See Md. I. 79, P. I. 151—ll. 16-17. Sgh says, Laṣāf is the name of a water in a place between Makka and AlBaṣra belonging to the Banū Yarbū' of the tribe of Tamīm : Bk says (AKB), Laṣāf, says Ath, is a water belonging to the Banū Yarbū' (Bk, AKB).

P. 698, l. 3. By Abū Muhawwish Rabi'a, or Ḥaut, Ibn Ri'āb alAsadi [alFaḵ'asī (Mb)], mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts who reached the Prophet, but did not see him. The poet is satirizing Nahshal Ibn Ḥarri (AKB)—l. 7. The version ^{فیه}, [which occurs in the ID. 137,] is transmitted by Jh and Sgh; and the version ^{فیه} by many, among them ISk, Kl, AAMr, and Bk (AKB)—l. 15. The reference is to p. 693, ll. 5-10. See the Note on p. 38, ll. 3-4—l. 18. "like ^{نَاشٍ}," means "governed by the rules laid down in p. 699, l. 20—p. 701, l. 3."

P. 700, l. 1. The father of Ḥanīfa and 'Ijl (MN). See Md. I. 160. But see too p. 27A, l. 18—l. 22. One of the champion poets of heathenism, who was named ^{صَاحِبَةُ الْعَرَبِ} *The Cymbalist, or Harper, of the Arabs* on account of the excellence of his poetry. He reached AlIslām at the end of his life; and set out, during the peace of AlḤudaibiya, [concluded between the Prophet and Kuraish in the year 6, and broken in the year 8 (SR, LM),] on a journey to the Prophet, in whose praise he composed an ode beginning ^{أَلَمْ تَعْتَضِ الْخَمْرَ} [126]: but he was dissuaded by Abū Sufyān at Makka from carrying out his intention; and went away to AlYamāma, where he was thrown by a camel and killed. The ode is an excellent one, numbering 24 verses, most of which are cited by the ML, while not one of them occurs among these Evidentiary Verses. [It is given at length in pp. 255-256 of the SR.] AlA'shā in lexicology is *he that sees not by night, but sees by day*, [i.e. *blind by night*];

and this A'shû became [altogether] blind towards the end of his life. The number of poets who were *blind by night* is 17 (AKB).

P. 701, l. 1. Iram is the name of a tribe; and 'Ād too is a tribe, vid. the people of [the Prophet (IBd)] Hūd (peace be upon him !) (AAz). He was Hūd Ibn 'Abd Allāh.....Ibn 'Ād Ibn 'Auṣ Ibn Iram Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ (IKb, Tr, IBd, B on VII. 63); or, as is said (Tr, B) by some genealogists (Tr), Hūd was ['Ābar (Tr)] Ibn Shālakh Ibn Arfakhshad Ibn Sām (Tr, K on VII. 63, B) Ibn Nūḥ (Tr, K), [grand] son of the uncle of the father of 'Ād (B). These two tribes, 'Ād Ibn 'Auṣ Ibn Iram and Thamūd Ibn Jāthar Ibn Iram, were descended from Iram; and they were the indigenous Arabs (Tr). Historians, however, divide the Arabs into 3 kinds, (1) extinct, i. e. the first Arabs, the details of whose histories have gone from us on account of the antiquity of their epoch, vid. 'Ād, Thamūd, Jadīs, Ṭasm, and the 1st Jurhum, who were in the time of 'Ād; whereas the 2nd Jurhum were among the children of Qaḥṭān: (a) Noah carried [in the Ark] those that God had commanded him to carry: and among them were the 3 sons of Noah, vid. Shem, Ham and Japheth, and their wives; and some say that he carried 6 [other] persons also, and some say 80 men [and women (Nw)], one of whom was [the 1st] Jurhum, all of the children of Seth (MAB): (b) 'Ād son of 'Auṣ Ibn Iram (SR), Thamūd and Jadīs, sons of [Jāthar or] 'Āthar Ibn Iram, and Ṭasm, ['Imlīk or (KF)] 'Imlīk, and Umaim, sons of Lāwadh Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ, were all of them Arabs (SR, TKh): so in the SR (TKh): (2) indigenous, i. e., the Arabs of AlYaman, vid. the Banū Qaḥṭān Ibn 'Ābar Ibn [Shālakh or] Shālāḥ Ibn Arfakhshad Ibn Sām Ibn Nūḥ, whence the Banū Jurhum Ibn Qaḥṭān and the Banū Saba Ibn Yashjub Ibn Ya'rub Ibn Qaḥṭān: (3) insititious, i. e., the children of Ismā'il Ibn Ibrāhīm, who, when Abraham had settled him at Makka, joined the 2nd Jurhum, who were residing in the neighbourhood of Makka, and took a wife from them, [vid. Ra'la (SK KA. XIII. 108, TKh) asSayyida (Tr), daughter of Muḍāḍ Ibn 'Amr alJurhumī (SR, Tr, KA, TKh)]; so that he and his children are called insititious Arabs, because Ishmael's origin and language were Hebrew

(MAB), and he [and his children (Iath)] learnt Arabic from Jurhum (Iath, IKhd, TKh) : (a) Kaïdhār Ibn Ismā'il was the father of the [in-sititious] Arabs (KF); and the tribes of the children of Ishmael branched out from 'Adnān (SR, TKh), who, according to the pedigree preferred, was 'Adnān Ibn Udd Ibn Udad.....Ibn Kaïdhār Ibn Ismā'il (MAB).

ج | *Azar* [the name of Abraham's father (K)] is most probably [a foreign proper name (B)] upon [the measure of (K)] نَاعِلٌ, like نَاعِلٌ (K), نَاعِلٌ (K, B on VI. 74), نَاعِلٌ, شَالِحٌ (K) [or] شَالِحٌ (B), نَاعِلٌ, and similar names of theirs (K)—l. 2. Khl says (Bk), Wabār was a country [193] belonging to 'Ad (Bk, AAz), between AlYaman and the sands of Yabru (Bk) : so in the Şihāḥ : but some say that Wabār [Ibn Umaim (Tr, MDh)] is the name [of the progenitor] of an ancient people of the indigenous Arabs, that perished like 'Ad and Thamūd (AAz)—l. 13. Ḥumaid Ibn Kaïs [alAsadī, their freedman (Nw),] alMakkī alA'raj (Nw, IHjr), the Reader, *d.* in or after 130 (IHjr). The A'raj celebrated for reporting Abū Hurairu is 'Abd ArRaḥman Ibn Hurmuz alA'raj, a Madanī Follower, a Kuraishī, freedman of Rabī'a Ibn AlḤārith Ibn 'Abd AlMuṭṭalib or of 'Umar Ibn Abī Rabī'a, *d.* 117, or, as is said, 110, the former being the true [date] (Nw)—l. 16. The Mu'adhdhin Abū Ḥaiwa Shuraiḥ Ibn Yazīd alḤaḍramī alḤimāṣī, *d.* 203 (IHjr)—l. 17. Ka'nab alTamīmī alKaṣī, of the 6th class of Traditionists, *vid.* those who were contemporary with the 5th, but are not authentically recorded as having met any of the Companions, like [the Follower of the Followers (Nw)] 'Abd AlMalik Ibn 'Abd Al'Azīz Ibn Juraij [alKuraishī (Nw)] alUmawī, their freedman, alMakkī, the Jurist, *d.* [149 (Nw),] 150, [151, or 160 (Nw),] being then past 70, or, as is said, past 100, which is not authentic (IHjr).

P. 703, l. l. In some MSS يوم ^أ is found instead of يوم ^أ in both places (MAd). So too in the M, IY, AAz, and AKB. III. 56. The Sh, Mr. I. 152, YS. II. 205, MAd, and MKh. II. 105 have يوم ^أ.

P. 704, l. 1. Alā'shà Maimūn (AKB)—l. 2. ISB says that Ḥayyān and Jābir were sons of 'Amīra of the Banū Ḥanīfa, and that Ḥayyān was a boon companion of Alā'shà (AKB)—l. 7. A freedman of [the Banū (IKhn)] Sulaim (IKhn, AKB), as is said (IKhn); or, as is said, one of the Banū Jadhīma Ibn Mālik Ibn Naṣr Ibn Ku'ain (AKB), of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima (IKb, ID): and God knows! (IKhn). He was a born poet. The cause of the ode was that Rabi'a had praised Yazīd Ibn Usaid, who was then Governor of Armenia, in an excellent poem; but Yazīd failed to reward him properly: whereas, when he praised Yazīd Ibn Ḥātim, the latter was extremely liberal to him (AKB).

P. 708, l. 1. Praising AnNu'mān Ibn AlMundhir (AKB)—ll. 3-4 AZ transmits the saying of the Rājiz

وَيْهًا فِدَاؤُكَ لَكَ يَا فَضَالَهٗ • أَجْرَهٗ الرَّمَحُ وَلَا تَهَالَهٗ

(IY, AKB) *Go on, let the people, or mankind, ransom thee, O Faḍāla! Make him trail the spear, and be not dismayed*, where فِدَاؤُكَ has literally no *ag.*,

but the *ag.* is understood from the context, i.e. لِيَفْدُكَ النَّاسُ and the like (AKB)—ll. 17-19. فِدَاؤُكَ is a verbal *n.* transferred from the *inf. n.* [187]. F says "It is *uninfl.* because it implies the sense of the *p.*, vid.

"the *imp.* ل, since فِدَاؤُكَ is constructively لِيَفْدُكَ; it is *uninfl.* "upon Kasr, because it denotes the *imp.*, and the *imp.*, when vocalized, "is vocalized with Kasr [664]; and they pronounce it with Tauwīn, "because it is *indet.*" (AKB).

P. 709, l. 20. See SB. I. 475.

P. 710, l. 22. مَكَانُكَ means اَلْزُمُ مَكَانُكَ keep thy place (R); [and so] مَكَانُكُمْ X. 29. means اَلزُّمُوا مَكَانَكُمْ keep your places (K, B): but these are explanations of the sense, not of the construction, otherwise the *pre.n.* in مَكَانُكَ and مَكَانُكُمْ would be a direct *obj.*, an *notadv.*

P. 712, l. 16 and l. 17. "what" means "the state of the *pron.* a *ag.*, *obj.*, or *gen.*"

P. 714, l. 24. I do not know who Jahm was; and God knows! (AKB).

P. 715, ll. 5-6. The [whole] verse occurs in the poems of 2 poets, (1) 'Uwaif alKawāfi, i. e. 'Uwaif Mu'āwiya [alFazārī (KA)], a minor poet of the Umawī dynasty : (2) Suhaim, or, as some name him, Hayya, the black Abyssinian slave of the Banu-l-Haṣḥās, who, says Ibn Hishām in the SR, were of Asad Ibn Khuzaima, a [celebrated (Is)] converted poet, who reached heathenism and AlIslām, and was killed in the Khilāfa of 'Uthmān; but in his poem the version is وَأَدَّ رَدْفِي And he that rode behind me cried (to the camels). And the 1st hemistich occurs in the beginning of a verse in an ode by Muḍarris Ibn Rib'ī.....Ibn Faḳ'as.. Ibn Asad Ibn Khuzaima, a good heathen poet, describing camels; and is followed by

وَقُلْنَ لِحَادِيهِنَّ هَلْ أَنتَ نَاطِرٌ

And said to their driver, Art thou waiting for him? (AKB)—l. 9. This is the meaning generally assigned: but some say that he means by the رَدْفٌ his follower of the Jinn; for, when the rhymes crowded together in his mind, and whispered to him, men used to say he had a devil that whispered to him; and, in this case, the *pron.* in دَعَاہُنَّ belongs to the rhymes, i.e. My devil called the rhymes, and they answered him, and poured out upon him, meaning that Poetry obeyed him (AKB).

P. 722, l. 17. I am not acquainted with the name of the author of this verse (MN). Fr says, It was recited to me by one of the Banū 'Ukail (AKB)—l. 18. AlAzd, or AlAsd, was the father of a tribe of AlYaman, vid. AlAzd Ibn AlGhauth Ibn Nabt Ibn Mālik [Ibn Zaid (IKb, KAb, Dh)] Ibn Kaḥṭān Ibn Saba, one of whose branches was called أَزْدُ شَنْوَةَ Asd Shanū'a, from شَنْوَةٌ meaning keeping aloof from

pollutions; and sometimes, says ISk, ^{أَزْدُ شَنْوَا} *Azd Shanūwa* (AKB)—l. 20. This is the last of 5 verses by Yazīd Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Khuwailid. aṣṣa’ik alKilabī; but Al‘Ainī says its author is ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ya’rub Ibn Mu’āwīya Ibn ‘Ubāda Ibn AlBakkā [Rabī’a (IKhn)] Ibn ‘Amir [Ibn Rabī’a Ibn ‘Amir Ibn Ṣa’ṣa’a (IKb, IKhn)]. It is generally related, [as by Al‘Ainī in the MN and FA,] with ^{بِالْمَاءِ الْحَمِيمِ} *with hot*, [or as some say, *cold* (MN, FA),] *water*; but Thi and Z relate it with ^{بِالْمَاءِ} *water*, which perhaps is from another poem (AKB).

P. 723, l. 6. According to R, ^{قَبْلَ} and ^{قَبْلَ} mean the same, e.g. ^{قَبْلَ} *before (that)*, both being intended to be understood as *pre.*: but ^{قَبْلَ} is *uninfl.* because the *post.* is suppressed; while ^{قَبْلَ} is *infl.* because the *post.* is, as it were, expressed by means of the compensatory Tanwīn.

P. 724, l. 15. Part of a poem recited by Ma’n Ibn Aus alMuzani in the presence of Mu’āwīya and ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AzZubair (Mb. 357).

P. 725, l. 1. There is another version ^{تَعَلَّاهُ بْنُ مُزَاهِمٍ} *Ta’illa Ibn Muṣāḥim* (MN)—ll. 4-5. Read “with ^{مِنْ قَدَامٍ}, [for ^{مِنْ قَدَامٍ}], making it *indet.*, like ^{مِنْ قَبْلٍ} [above], ^{مِنْ عَلٍ} [below], and the like; but”—l. 14. “[the sign of] the *nom.* and *acc.*” here (R. II. 81, l. 5) is a loose expression for “Ḍamm or the sign of the *acc.*”

P. 726, l. 15. And also, if it were *pre.*, ^{مِنْ عَلِيٍّ} meaning *from above me* would be said, because the sense requires that, not ^{مِنْ عَلِيٍّ} (DM).

P. 728, l. 6. IBr says that this Rajaz is by Ghailān Ibn Ḥuraith arRaba’ī; but I have not met with any information about Ghailān (AKB)—l. 7. The A’shā of Bāhila was ‘Amir Ibn AlḤarith, a celebrated heathen poet, author of *epitaph* on his half-brother by his mother’s

side, AlMuntashir Ibn Wahb, as AU says, or Ibn Hubaira Ibn Wahb, as As says (AKB).

P. 732, l. 7. On the clause "the saying ^{أَفْ} ^{أَفْ} being a solecism" (p. 730, ll. 7-8) the DM has a Note to the same effect as this passage from the Fk; and from this Note the words "like R" have been abstracted.

P. 733, l. 18. The *dem.* "this", as appears from the Sn, may include the two usages of ^{أَفْ} ^{أَفْ}, as an *indet. ep.* and as a *prim. substantive*.

P. 735, l. 20. See Mb. 698, ll. 2-6.

P. 736, l. 2. The *n. of time* is said to be in sense the *adv.* of the *inf. n.* of, i.e. implied by, the *prop.*, because it denotes the *time of the occurrence indicated by the inf. n.*, as LI. 13., where ^{أَفْ} ^{أَفْ} denotes the *time of their being burnt*, contrary to IV. 50., where ^{أَفْ} ^{أَفْ} does not denote the *time of Our deforming*. It is not in letter the *adv.* of the *inf. n.*, because it is not governed in the *acc.* by that *inf. n.* [64].

P. 738, l. 19. This verse is from an ode by Abū Ḳais [Ṣaifi (ID)] Ibn 'Āmir alĀslat Ibn Jusham.....Ibn AlAus [alAnṣārī (AGh) alAusī (Is)], a heathen poet. The author of the KA says his name has not come to my knowledge; but IHjr in the Is says his name was Ṣaifi or AlḤārith or 'Abd Allāh or Ṣirma or something else; [and the first 3 names are given in the AGh]. He died 10 months after the Hijra: or, [when the Prophet arrived at AlMadīna (Is),] he fled to Makka, and abode with Ḳuraish until the year of the Conquest, [i.e. the year 8 (SR, LM)]. But Z attributes the verse to AshShammākh; some of the Commentators of S to a man of Kināna; and a learned foreigner to Abū Ḳais Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī. No one, however, called Abū Ḳais Ibn Rifā'a is to be found in the Books of the Companions: but only 1 or 2 Companions called Ḳais Ibn Rifā'a, the 1st being Ḳais Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī [alAusī] alWāḳifī, of the Banū Wāḳif, [whose name was Malīk (Nw),] Ibn Imra alḲais Ibn Malīk Ibn AlAus, mentioned in the MSh; and the 2nd Ḳais Ibn Rifā'a.....Ibn Numair alAnṣārī,

who was a poet, and, says IHjr, may perhaps be the same as the preceding (AKB). The name of Abū Kais Ibn Rifā'a alAnṣārī was Dīnār (Jsh).

P. 739, l. 8. Jj composed a Commentary, which he named the *Mughnī*, on the *Idāh* of F (HKh)—l. 18. This hemistich is from a long ode by AlFarazdaq satirizing Jarīr, of which we must mention two verses in order that its meaning may become manifest, vid.

أَنَا لَنَضْرِبُ رَأْسَ كُلِّ قَبِيلَةٍ * وَأَبُوكَ خَلْفَ أَتَانِهِ يَتَقَمَّلُ
يَهْزَأُ لَهْرَانِهِ عَقْدَةً عِنْدَ الْخَصِيِّ * يَا ذُلَّ حَيْثُ يَكُونُ مَنْ يَتَذَلُّ

Verily we smite the head of every tribe; and thy father, behind his she-ass, kills lice. His squeeze with the thumb and forefinger crushes the small lice beside the testicles. O elo! The عَقْد is a mode of counting with the fingers of the two hands; and he means the عَقْدُ الثَّلَاثِينَ counting of thirty, which is effected by placing your thumb at the end of the fore-finger, i.e. by joining their tips, like the holder of a needle (AKB).

P. 743, l. 8. This text is somewhat garbled in the R (vol. II, p. 84, l. 19).

P. 745, ll. 10-11. بِغَيْرِهَا by something else (ML), i.e. مِنْ (DM). Lane (p. 683, col. 2) says "by another prep.", thus making كَذَى in the subsequent ex. a prep.

P. 746, l. 14. Lane (p. 683, col. 3) has "where I saw Zeyd".

P. 747, ll. 6-7. كَذَا represents the 2 regs. of أَنْ, e.g. زَيْدًا قَائِمًا; and أَنْ with its 2 regs. is renderable by a single term, e.g. قِيَامُ زَيْدٍ, post. to حَيْثُ, From the place, i.e. circumstance or fact, that Zaid is standing, i.e. of Zaid's standing, i.e. Whereas Zaid is standing, حَيْثُ place in مِنْ حَيْثُ أَنْ, signifying circumstance or fact, like جَا place in the similar Persian expression از آنجا که From that place, i.e., circumstance or

fact, that, i.e., Whereas—l. 11. An [excellent (KA, MN) Islāmī (AKB)] poet, contemporary with the Umawī and ‘Abbāsī dynasties (KA, MN, AKB), *d.* in the year 180 odd (AKB).

P. 755, l. l. Insert “but the 2 doctrines [of *redundance* and *verification* (DM)] are of no account, [because they involve the assertion of exclusion of a word from its well known meaning without any evidence (DM)] :” before “while.”

P. 756, ll 4-5. This is what determines that “the text” [in p. 755, l. l. and p. 756, l. 3] must be taken to refer to XLIII. 38. (DM); and not, as Lane (p. 39, col. 1, ll. 47-52) supposes, to II. 28.

P. 757, l. 12. I have seen in the KA what indicates that this verse is by ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu’tazz; though its last hemistich is cited in the form of

وَالدَّارُ جَامِعَةٌ أَزْمَانٍ أَزْمَانًا

When the home was uniting us times and times [211]: but I have seen the verse attributed to one of the Arabs in the *Nawādir* of AZ, who cites it in the same form as IHsh; and AZ died before ‘Abd Allāh Ibn AlMu’tazz was born (SM). See KA. IX. 142.

P. 758, l. 3. See Md. II. 219 and P. II. 677.

P. 759, l. 16. I. e. Having already the sense, اِذَا now acquires the government, of اِنْ though the affixion of مَا (see p. 771, l. l.)—l. 19. The argument is that, the government of the *apoc.* by اِذَا not being explicable on the ground of composition, اِذَا must be an *apocopative p.*—

l. l. The author of the 2 verses [cited in § 589] is said [by S and others (AKB)] to be ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Hammām asSalūlī (S, AKB), of the Banū Murra Ibn Ša’sa’a of Kais ‘Ailān, who are known as the Banū Salūl, their mother being Salūl Bint Dhuhl Ibn Shaibān Ibn Tha’laba, wife of Murra Ibn Ša’sa’a. This ‘Abd Allāh was an Islāmī poet of the Followers. The poet traces his lineage to Fahm [Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Kais Ibn ‘Ailān (IHb, IKb)] and Ashja’ [Ibn Ruith Ibn Ghafān Ibn Sa’d

Ibn ẖais (IHb, IKb)], though he was of Salāl, because they were all of ẖais [Ibn] 'Ailān Ibn Muḍar (AKB).

P. 760, l. 1. *Dele* the semicolon.

P. 761, l. 1. The construction of this text mentioned by IHsh does not occur in the language of Z (DM). [The latter indeed says on X. 22.,] It is as though He said ^{وَاِذَا رَحِمْنَاهُمْ مِنْۢ بَعْدِ ضَرٍّ اَدَّ فَاَجَارًا وَقَوَّعَ الْمَكْرَ}
^{اَسْرًا} *And, when We have mercy on them after a hardship, they suddenly*
fall to the occurrence of plotting proceeding from them (K); but the context shows that this is intended as an explanation of the sense of *haste* in the 2nd ^{اِذَا}, not of its *op.*

P. 764, l. 1. In XXX. 24. the 1st ^{اِذَا} is *cond.* (K); and the 2nd ^{اِذَا} denotes *suddenness of occurrence*, and [therefore (B)] supplies the place of the ^ف in the *correl.* (K, B) of the 1st (B), [i.e.] of the condition (K) —l. 15. By Ka'b Ibn Zuhair (S). ^{اِذَا} is *abstractive* [1] (N). Translate *I rouse in her* (the *she-camel*), *at the end of the night, a terrified wild bull*, MDE's rendering in the text being a paraphrase.

P. 765, l. 18. This verse is from an ode containing more than 10 verses by 'Abd ẖais Ibn Khufāf, of the Barājim, [a people of the children of Ḥanẖala Ibn Mālīk (KF),] an Islāmī [poet]; but I have seen these verses attributed to Ḥāritha Ibn Badr alGhudānī atTamīmī (SM).

P. 766, l. 18. An Islāmī poet. AHm says he was of the Banū Kināna Ibn Alẖain.....Ibn ẖudā'a, and lived 200 years; and he is mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the converts, who reached the itme of the Prophet, and become Muslims, but saw him not (AKB); and AUd says he was a heathen (Is).

P. 769, l. 7. After "the ^{اِذَا}" insert "of inception". Z and B also hold the ^{اِذَا} in this text to be the ^{اِذَا} of inception, for the same reason as in LXXV. 1. (see the Note on Vol. II, p. 116, l. 2); and they meet the objection that the ^{اِذَا} of inception, when prefixed to the *aor.*, gives the sense of the *present* with the reply that, when combined with

سُرٍّ, it is divested of the sense of the *present*, and denotes *were corroborated* [404], as the *art.* in اَللّٰهُ لَ [52] is divested of the sense of *determination*, and becomes a mere *compensation* for the Hamza of اَللّٰهُ : but IHsh declares that this is an unnecessary elaboration ; and asserts that the ج of the oath is sometimes necessary when the و is disallowed, vid. when the *aor.* is conjoined with the *p.* of amplification, as in XIX. 67. (see the K and B on XIX. 67., and the ML on the ج).

P. 771, l. 10. The Banù Faḳ'as were a clan of the Banù Asad (T, AKB) Ibn Khuzaima. These verses are attributed also to 'Amr Ibn Asad alFaḳ'asī ; and God knows ! (AKB).

P. 772, l. 7. Abū Lailā is the surname of AlḤārith Ibn Zālim alMurri, a heathen (AKB)—*ibid.* The sense is قَاتِلُ الْمُتَضَرِّعَةِ (AKB).

P. 773, ll. 1, 5. The *gen.* after بَيْنَا in this verso, printed by Jahn (IY. 551) as the sole, and by Thorbecke (D. 64) as an alternative version, seems to be out of place here, because the discussion is about the propriety of introducing اَلْجَنَّةَ and اَلْجَنَّةَ into the *correl.* of بَيْنَا, which has a *correl.* only when it is *pre.*, as in the version with the *nom.*, to a *prop.* (see p. 773, ll. 8-10) ; not when it is *pre.*, as in the version with the *gen.*, to a single term—l. 10. It is related [by H in the D (IKhn, HH) on the authority of IKlb (D)] that 'Abid [or 'Umair (AGh, Is, CD), which perhaps is due to a mistake (Is, CD) in hearing (Is),] Ibn [Shariya (Is, CD) or] Sharya alJurhumī, who lived [240 or, as is said (AGh, Is, CD),] 300 years, and reached AlIslām, and became a Muslim, entered the presence of Mu'āwiya [Ibn Abī Sufyān (IKhn, HH)] in Syria, when he was Khalīfa. Then said Mu'āwiya to him "Tell me the most wonderful of what thou hast seen." He said "I passed one day by some people burying a dead man of theirs ; and, when I had come up to them, mine eyes filled with tears, and I quoted the saying of the poet." [Here follow 6 verses, of which the two in the text are the 4th and

5th.] "Then said a man to me 'Dost thou know who is the author
 "of this poem?' I said 'No, [by God, except that I have been
 "reciting it for a long time! (HH)]. He said '[By Him thou swearest
 "'by (HH),] verily the author of it is this [companion of ours (HH)],
 "'whom we have buried at this hour!'".....Then said Mu'āwiyā to
 him "Verily thou hast seen a wonder: then who was the dead man?"
 He said "[He was (D, FH)] 'Ithyar Ibn Labīd al'Udhri" (D, IKhn,
 HH. II. 119). But to this there is the objection that [the corpse on the
 bier and (SM)] the author of the verses was a man of [the Banū (CD)]
 'Udhra called Ḥurnith Ibn Jabala (SM, CD); and that [fact] is
 positively asserted by Z in the Exposition of the Evidentiary Verses of S
 (SM). 'Abīd lived till the Khilāfa of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān (Is, CD).

P. 774, l. 7. I. e. the full phrase in ^{6 6 6}يَبْأُ ذِي قَانِمٍ (see p. 776, l. 3).

P. 776, l. 13. After "*ps.*," insert "[While etc, lo, he saw Hind,]"
 —l. 21. alJurabī, of Juraib Ibn Sa'd Ibn Hudhail, a heathen poet
 (AKB)—l. 23. ^{6 6 6}كُتَا'ِدا Kūtā'ida, [as is said (MI, AKB) by ISB (AKB),]
 is a [well known (ZJ, MI, N) narrow (AKB)] mountain-road (ZJ, MI,
 N, AKB): but As says that every mountain-road is a ^{6 6 6}كُتَا'ِدا; and, accord-
 ing to his saying, its triptote declension [in the verse] is not due to
 poetic license (AKB).

P. 779, l. 8. A minor Islāmi poet (KA), reckoned by MIS in the
 2nd class of the Poets of AlIslām (AKB). He was a Christian (KA,
 AKB), and then became a Muslim; and he was the sister's son of
 AlAkhtal (AKB). IAl says that the first thing mentioned of him is
 that he arrived at Damascus in the Khilāfa of AlWalīd Ibn 'Abd
 AlMalik, or, as is said, of 'Umar Ibn 'Abd Al'Azīz (KA)—l. 14. Of the
 Banu-Ḥārith Ibn Hammām [Ibn Murra Ibn Dhuhl Ibn Shaibān ash-
 Shaibānī (T)], a Ṣaḥābī poet, mentioned by IHjr in the Is (AKB).

P. 781, ll. 15-16. See the whole poem at pp. 568-569 of the SR.

P. 784, l. 20. Its author is said by Jh to be Abu-nNajm ; and by some to be Ru'ba Ibn Al'Ajjāj, but it is not in his *Dīwān* (MN) : and AZ says in his *Nawādir* that MD said "Abu-lGhāl recited it to me as by one of the people of AlYaman" (MN, AKB) ; but Akh says in the Exposition of the *Nawādir* that AHm said "I asked AU about these "verses, and he said, 'Put a mark upon them : this is a forgery of MD'" (AKB).

P. 785, l. 9. For "red." read "*red.*"—l. 14. The reference is to p. 568, l. 15.

P. 786, l. 19. K1 says that Rauḥ recited this poem in the presence of 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān (MN). Rauḥ is mentioned by some among the Companions : but Companionship is not correctly attributable to him ; though he may have been born in the time of the Prophet, for his father was a Companion. He is mentioned in the 2nd class of the Followers of the people of Syria ; and is said to have been a Governor over Palestine. He died in 84 (Is).

P. 787, l. 11. For "bears" read "hears"—l. 20. Read "the Ranū Tamīm".

P. 788, l. 19. From a *Rajaz* in the *Nawādir* of AZ, who heard it from the Arabs (AKB).

P. 791, l. 5. The celebrated poet (MAd).

P. 794, l. 3. 'Ifāk Ibn Murayy [alKushairī, who had taken up his abode in the neighbourhood of Bāhila (AKB),] was seized in a famine by AlAḥḍab Ibn 'Amr alBāhili, who roasted and ate him (KF, AKB).

مَرَى with Damm of the م, Faṭḥ of the ر, and reduplication of the م (AKB): مَرَى (KF)—l. 4. عُنَقَاء is fem. of عُنُق, and means *Long-necked*.

Sgh says, عُنَقَاء is *Calamity*, as عُنَقَاء طَارَتْ بِهْ *Calamity flew away with him*, being orig. a *Great Bird* known in name, unknown in body. AHm says in the Book of Birds, As for عُنَقَاء المَغْرِبَةِ, it is *Calamity*, not one

of the birds that we know. And ID says, ^{عَنْقَاءٌ مُغْرَبٌ} is a phrase that has no foundation [in fact]: it is said to be [the name of] a *Great Bird* seen only [once] in ages; but was so frequently used that they named *Calamity* ^{عَنْقَاءٌ مُغْرَبٌ}, as

وَلَوْلَا سُلَيْمَانُ الْخَلِيفَةُ حَلَقَتْ * بِهِ مِنْ يَدِ الْحِجَّاجِ عَنْقَاءٌ مُغْرَبٌ

And, but for Sulaimān the Khalīfa, a calamity from the hand of AlḤajjāj would have soared away with him. And ^{مُغْرَبٌ} is an act. part. from ^{أَغْرَبَ الرَّجُلُ فِي الْبِلَادِ} when he goes far in them by incessant journeying; and is ep. of ^{عَنْقَاءٌ}, meaning *far-flying*: Sgh says that the *ē* of feminization is elided in the same way as in ^{نَاقَةٌ ضَامِرٌ} A lank-bellied she-camel, i.e. ^{ذَاتُ ضَمِرٍ} possessed of lankness in the belly [312]; and so Z explains the masculinization of the ep.: but ^{مُغْرَبَةٌ} also is said (AKB).

P. 795, ll. 1-2. IS is followed by his pupil F, who is followed by his pupil IJ and by [another pupil] Abd (BS)—l. 22. For “v.” read “v.”

P. 798, l. 18. By [‘Abd Allāh] Ibn Hammām asSalūlī (S).

P. 800, l. 22. Abū Abd ArRaḥmān ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥabīb asSulamī (IKb, IATH, IHjr, TH, TKh) alKaṣī (IKb, IHjr, TH), the Reader (IKb, IHjr, TH, TKh) of Al‘Irāq (TKh), one of the companions of ‘Alī (IKb), studied under ‘Uthmān and Ibn Mas‘ad (TKh), taught Reading 40 years (TH, TKh), d. after 70 (IHjr, TH), in 74 (TKh), in 92 (TH), or in 105 at the age of 90 (IATH, TH).

P. 801, l. 19. The reference is to pp. 85, l. 21—86, l. 12.

P. 802, ll. 14-15. If the *n.* were not complete, the verbal *prop.* would be its ep. [44]; and, if this *prop.* did not contain the *pron.* of the *cond. n.*, it could be neither *enunc.* [27], nor ep. [144], of the latter.

P. 803, l. 15. The reference is to vol. II, p. 679, ll. 13-17.

P. 805, ll. 5-14. According to S, كَيْفٌ is an *adv.*; but, according to Akh and Sf, it is a non-adverbial *n.* (ML).

P. 810, l. 6.

لَا جَعْلُنَ لَابْنَةِ عَتَمٍ فَنَّا * مِنْ أَيْنَ عَشْرُونَ لَهَا مِنْ أَنَّى

I will assuredly make for the daughter of 'Uthmān a sort (of altercation), or a wonderful matter. From where has she twenty (camels), from where? This verse is from a poem in the *Rajaz* metre transmitted from Th by Akh in the Exposition of the *Dīwān* of AZ. Akh says, Mb and Th say that by عَتَمَ he means عَثْمَانُ; but elides the ا and ن by poetic license, and pronounces its initial with Fathā to indicate what is elided; and Th says that by فَنَّا he means a sort (of altercation). ISk says that these verses were a satire on a Collector of the poor-rate. And Sf says, The *Rajaz* is by Mudrik Ibn Ḥuṣayn; فَنَّا means a wonderful matter; and عَشْرُونَ means twenty (camels) (AKB).

P. 815, l. 10. And (o) أَرْمَانُ أَرْمَانُ times (and) times, says IJ (AKB. III. 346), as in the hemistich cited in the Note on p. 757, l. 12—l. 18. Ibn Ḥujr alKindī (Jsh). The poets named Imra alKais are many, among them Imra alKais Ibn Ḥujr alKindī, Imra alKais Ibn 'Ānis alKindī, and Imra alKais Ibn Mālik anNumairī (Mr).

P. 816, l. 13. By Dābi Ibn AlḤarith [at Tamīmī (AKB)] alBurjūmī (Lane, p. 1380, col. 3), of the Banū Ghālib Ibn Ḥanzala, who reached the Prophet, and died in prison in the time of 'Uthmān. AlBurjūmī is a *rel. n.* to the Barājim, who are 6 clans of the children of Ḥanzala Ibn Mālik Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm, vid. Kais, 'Amr, Ghālib, Kulfa, Zulaim, [sons of Ḥanzala (IKb, ID),] and Mukāshir, who received the cognomen of AlBarājim because a man of them named Ḥaritha Ibn Āmir said to them "Come; then let us combine like the بُرْجُومُ *finger*."

joints, [the *sing.* of which is ^{جُزْءٌ} (ID),] of this my hand;" whereupon they did so, and were then named ^{أَلْبُرْجُ}, which are *the joints of the fingers*, 3 in each finger (AKB).

P. 817, l. 1. By AlFarazdaq (AKB).

P. 818, l. 7. Al'Amrī, one of the Banū 'Amr Ibn AlḤārith Ibn Tamīm Ibn Sa'd Ibn Hudhail, an Islāmī poet; a convert, according to what is mentioned in the Is on the authority of AlMarzubānī; but, according to the KA, a poet of the Umawī dynasty, one of their eulogists, who composed odes on 'Abd AlMalik Ibn Marwān and 'Abd Al'Azīz Ibn Marwān, with the latter of whom he abode long in Egypt (AKB).

P. 819, ll. 4-5, 13, 21. See HH. I. 326.

P. 822, ll. 13-15. I.e. S makes it *uninfl.* in both members, but Z only in the 1st member.

P. 823, l. 16. See the Note on p. 14, l. 1—ll. 17-18. Saif adDaula Abu-lḤasan 'Alī Ibn 'Abd Allāh Ibn Ḥamdān atTaghlabī, who became chief of Aleppo in 333, [and before that was chief of Wāsiṭ and those regions (ITB),] b. 301 or 303, d. 356 (IKhn, ITB). His sister Khaula died in 352 (ITB).

P. 826, l. 1. . Of the *Madīd* [metre] (MN). ^{نَعِيمٌ} is *post* to ^{نَعِيمٌ} (DM): but ^{نَعِيمٌ} would violate the metre; and I think that ^{نَعِيمٌ} is like ^{أَعْلَانَاتِ الْعَالِيَةِ} (see pp. 363, 463, 489), meaning *and how many prosperous men, subjects* (see the next Note).

P. 829, l. 1. This verse, where the *sp.* of ^{كَمْ} occurs *pl.* and *sing.*, combines both constructions (DM); and, but for the pluralization of the *pron.* in the *enunc.* ^{بَادِرًا} [222], I should have translated the 2nd hemistich *and how many a prosperous subject* (literally *a prosperous man, a subject*) *has perished!*

P. 830, l. 22. After "riding-beast" insert an Italicized note of admiration—l. 24. The *sp.* of كَم is مُحَدِّدٌ غَارَهَا (AAz, MN); and the phrase is constructively وَكَم دُونَهُ بَقَعَةٌ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ دُونَهُ (AAz): or rather, as I suppose, the *sp.* is بَقَعَةٌ or the like suppressed, qualified by مُحَدِّدٌ غَارَهَا, the full phrase being وَكَم دُونَهُ بَقَعَةٌ مِنَ الْأَرْضِ مُحَدِّدٌ غَارَهَا, otherwise it is difficult to account for the gender of the *pron.* attached to غَارُ, which is the *ag.* of مُحَدِّدٌ.

P. 831, l. 7. Its author is said to be Dhu-rRumma; but I have not found it in his *Dīwān* (MN)—l. 12. The verse occurs anonymously in the S and M; and not one of their Commentators [except IY] has attributed it to its author: but [IY followed by] Al'Aini says it is by AlFarazdaq; and God knows! (AKB)—l. 15. This is one of some verses attributed by the author of the KA to Anas Ibn Zunaim alKināni, a Ṣaḥābi poet, who said them to 'Ubad Allāh Ibn Ziyād Ibn Sumayya, Governor of Al'Irāk, [k. 67 (IKb, IAth)]: so say the author of the KA, the Expositors of the verses of S, and the Commentators of the *Jumal*. And the 1st verse [with a different version] is cited by R in the Commentary on the SH to show that دَعَّ *pret.* of دَعَّ has been heard [482]. The verses have also been attributed to 'Abd Allāh Ibn Kuraiz, and to Abu-lAṣwad adDu'alī; and God knows! (AKB)—ll. 23-25. This means that, when the *sp.* of the *interrog.* كَم would, if كَم were not separated from it, be governed in the *gen.* [224], it is treated, when كَم is separated from it, in the same way as the *sp.* of the separated enunciatory كَم.

P. 834, l. 7. Read "Banū".

P. 840, l. 7. 'Umar, or Muḥammad; [or 'Abd Allāh (Dh),] Ibn 'Abd ArRaḥmān Ibn Muḥaiṣin [asSahmī (IHjr)], the Reader [of the people (IHjr)] of Makka (Dh, IHjr), who studied reading under

Mujāhid (Dh), d. 123 (IHjr)—l. 16. The IY (p. 587, l. 14) has كَيْتٌ and ذَيْتٌ without repetition.

P. 841, ll. 9-12. IBr says, This distinction is the opinion of Th and his followers; while Khl and S and their followers make no distinction between them: and H sometimes forgets what he says here, for he says in his *Maḳāmāt* فَتَهَقَّهُوا مِنْ كَيْتٍ وَكَيْتٍ وَأَمَّا إِضْحَكُهُمْ خَبْرٌ ذَيْتٌ ذَيْتٌ, Then they burst out laughing at such and such a story, and only the announcement of such and such an affair made them laugh (CD). See H. 235, where, however, I do not find وَأَمَّا النَّحْءُ. Thorbecke (D. 99) omits the , throughout, printing ذَيْتٌ ذَيْتٌ and كَيْتٌ كَيْتٌ; but the Constantinople ed. (p. 60) and the CD (p. 143) give it.

P. 842, ll. 20-21. As

كَانَ بَيْنَ فِجْهَهِ وَالْفَكِّ • فَأَرَاهُ مِسْكِ ذُبْحَتْ فِي سَكِّ

(IY, R), by Manẓūr Ibn Marthad alAsadī, praising a woman for fragrance of the mouth, *As though between her jaw and the jaw were a bag of musk slit open in perfume of the kind called سَكِّ (AKB), meaning بَيْنَ فِجْهَهِ between her two jaws (IY, AKB). Manẓūr Ibn Marthad, also called Ibn Ḥabba, Ḥabba being his mother, was a Rājiz of the Banū Asad Ibn Khuzaima (AKB). سَكِّ (IY): سَكِّ with Damm of the س (AKB). In vol. II, p. 690, l. 1, read "Ḥabba".*

P. 843, l. 4. الذَّامُّ is a dial. var. of الذَّمُّ (AKB)—l. 5. A heathen poet: Zimmān [Ibn Mālik Ibn Ṣa'b Ibn 'Alī Ibn Bakr Ibn Wā'il in Rabi'a (IHb)] was one of the poet's ancestors, and was of the Banū Ḥanīfa (AKB); [or more correctly] the Banū Zimmān were of Mālik Ibn Ṣa'b, but were reckoned among [their cousins] the Banū Ḥanīfa Ibn Lujaim Ibn Ṣa'b (IKb).

P. 845, l. 17. By AlKumait Ibn Tha'labā (Md, AKB) alAsadī, a Faḳ'asī Asadī Islāmī poet, called AlKumait alAkbar, grand-father of AlKumait Ibn Ma'rūf Ibn AlKumait alAkbar. He became a Muslim in the time of the Prophet, but did not join him; and is mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts on the authority of AU and AlMarzubānī (AKB). He has elided the ^ء from فَزَارَةٌ as it is elided in curtailment, although this is in the *non-voc.* [58]; or he may have meant مِنْ فَزَارِيٍّ, and then lightened the ^ى of relation (Md)—l. 18. The Banū Fazāra are taunted with eating the penis of the he-ass (AKB). The story is that 3 men joined company together, a Fazārt, a Taghlabi, and a Kilabi. They found a [wild (AKB)] he-ass; and, when the Fazārt had gone away on one of his needs, they cooked and ate, but kept the yard of the he-ass for the Fazārt. On his return, they said to him "We have kept for thee [thy share (AKB)]: then eat". So he set about eating [it (Md)], but was [almost (Md)] unable to swallow it. Then [said he "Was all the roast-meat of the he-ass a penis?"; and (Md)] they began to laugh. Then he perceived [the trick played upon him]; and took the sword, [and went up to them (AKB),] and said "Ye shall assuredly eat [of (AKB)] it, or I will [surely (Md)] slay you" (Md, AKB). Then they refused; so he smote one of them, and killed him; and the other took it, and ate of it (AKB). For Md's ending of the story see the Note on p. 588, ll. 18-19—l. 19.—The 1st Fazāra is the tribe of Fazāra, and the 2nd is their eponymous ancestor.

P. 846, l. 2. Khiṭām, or Bishr, Ibn Naṣr, of the Banu-lAbyaḍ Ibn Mujāshī' Ibn Dārim, the Rājiz (AKB).

P. 849, l. 9. مَلِيَّان (M): مَلِيَّان and مَلِيَّ (IY): مَلِيَّان and مَلِيَّ (Mb. 59)—l. 21. See Md. I. 151 and P. I. 301.

P. 850, l. 20. مَلِيَّ (A).

P. 851, l. 7. مَلِيَّ Devotee (IA): مَلِيَّ Excellent reader (R).

P. 852, l. 19. عَاشُورَآءِ (A), apparently a misprint.

P. 853, l. 1. This verse is the last of an ode composed by AlFarazdaq at the end of his life, when repenting towards God of his excesses in his satirizing people; and in it he blames Iblis for having misled him in his youth (AKB).

P. 854, l. 1. The *du. pron.* relates to Iblis and his son (AKB)—l. 3. By “the barker” he means *the poet that applies himself to satire and abuse*; and like it is “the howler” (AKB)—ll. 4-5. دُرُ being *orig.* دُرِي, its *du.* ought to be دُرِيَا, but is دُرَا; so that its *ل* is not restored: while the *du.* of دَات, *orig.* دُرَات, like نَرَاة, is دُرَاتَا; so that the *ل*, i.e. the *ل* substituted for the *ي*, is restored. R in another place (*vol. I, p. 266*) says “The *ل* of دُر is *ا*, as is proved by دُرَاتَا and دُرَات, “because the *cat.* of طَوْنِيَت is more numerous than that of الْقَوَّة, and to “make it accord with the most prevalent is better”; and “the *ع* is “elided in دَات from frequency of usage”—l. 20. Abū Bilāl Mirdās Ibn ‘Amr Ibn Ḥudair [alḤanzālī (Iath)], of [the Banū. (ID)] Rabī‘a Ibn Ḥanzala [Ibn Mālik Ibn Zaid Manāt Ibn Tamīm (Mb)], was known, like his brother ‘Urwa, as Ibn Udayya, she being a [heathen (Mb)] grandmother of theirs (IKb, ID). He revolted against ‘Ubaid Allāh Ibn Ziyād (ID), and was killed in 61 (Iath). ‘Urwa was killed by ‘Ubaid Allāh Ibn Ziyād (IKb, Iath) in 58 (Iath). For “Udayya” [in *vol. II, p. 142, l. 15*] one MS [of the D] has “Udhaina,” which is correct (CD). ‘Urwa Ibn Udhaina alLaithī, [of the Banū Laith, a Kinānī (T)], alḤijāzī, the celebrated poet, *d.* about 130 (FW)—l. 21. ID, who is the authority in this matter, attributes the verse to ‘Alī Ibn Baddāl Ibn Sulaim; and God knows! (AKB).

P. 855, l. 12. Attributed by Sgh to Shu‘ba Ibn [‘Umar (Is) or] Ḳumair [aṭṬuhawī, a heathen (Is), or] a converted poet, who [reached Allislām (Is), and] believed in the time of Prophet, but did not see him

mentioned by IHjr in the Is among the Converts (AKB). One of the 2 ف is *red.*, as in لَا تُجْزَعِي الْخَم [62, 540] (AAz)—l. 20. alKalbi, an Islāmi poet (AKB).

P. 856, l. 17. By AlFarazdaq, satirizing Jarīr, whom he ridicules, and makes out to be a woman. He likens each half of the ^{أُفٍّ} [mentioned 2 verses before, and] here meaning *vulva*, to the *face of a Turk*, the Turks being coarse, broad, and red in the face (AKB)—l. l. The Mother of the Believers (Is), Ḥafṣa Bint 'Umar Ibn AlKhattāb, is said to have been born [when Qurāish were building the House (Nw),] 5 years before the Mission [of the Prophet (Nw)]; was married by the Apostle of God [After 'Ā'isha (Is)] in the year 2 or 3, [the latter date being preferable (Is)]; and died in the year 27, [28 (Nw),] 41, 45, (Nw, Is), 47, or 50, at the age of 60 (Nw). Between the *Hijra* and the birth of the Apostle of God were 53 years 2 months and 8 days; between the *Hijra* and the Mission of the Apostle of God were 13 years 2 months and 8 days; and between the *Hijra* and the death of the Apostle of God were 9 years 11 months and 22 days (AF). The *Hijra* is the beginning of the Islāmi era (Nw, AF); and the first [person] that dated by the *Hijra* was 'Umar Ibn AlKhattāb in the year 17 of the *Hijra* (Nw). The *Hijra* occurred (AF, TKh) in the 14th year of the Mission (TKh), when AlMuḥarram, Ṣafar, and 8 days of Rabi' alAwwal had elapsed. So, when they resolved upon founding [the era of] the *Hijra*, they went back 68 days, and made the beginning of the era the 1st of AlMuḥarram of this year. Then they computed from the 1st of AlMuḥarram to the last day of the Prophet's life, and it was 10 years and 2 months; whereas, when his age is really reckoned from the *Hijra*, he is found to have lived 9 years 11 months and 22 days after it, [the difference between the 2 periods being 2 months and 8 days, i.e. 68 days] (AF). [But the assertion that the period from the 1st of AlMuḥarram in the year of the *Hijra* to the last day of the Prophet's life was 10 years and 2 months is difficult to reconcile with the state-

ment that] he died (God bless him, and give him peace !) in the forenoon, [or, as is said, at midday (AF),] on Monday, when 12 nights were left, [i.e. on the 18th,] of Rabī' alAwwal in the year 11 [of the *Hijra* (Nw), i.e. 10 years 2 months and 18 days from, and including, the 1st of AlMuḥarram in the year of the *Hijra*]. He died at the age of 63, the [most correct and (Nw)] best-known [opinion]; or, as is said, 65 or 60 (Nw, AF). The preferable opinion is that he was sent [on his Apostolic Mission] at 40 years, and abode in Makka calling [the unbelievers] to AlIslām 13 years and a fraction, and abode at AlMadīna after the *Hijra* nearly 10 years; and that is 63 years and some fractions (AF). If, then, Ḥaṣṣa was born 5 years before the Mission, she was 18 or a little more at the beginning of the *Hijrī* era; so that, if she lived 60 years, she died in 41.

P. 857, ll. 25-26. The truth is that these 2 verses are from a *Rajaz* by Khiṭām alMujāshi'ī, an Islāmī poet; not by Himyān Ibn Kuḥāfa (AKB) the Rājiz (ID).

P. 859, l. 8. Abū 'Aṭā was a contemporary of the 2 dynasties: he praised the Banū Umayya and the Banū Hāshim (KA). Yazīd Ibn 'Umar Ibn Hubaira [alFazārī (ITB), b. 87 (IKhn)], governor of the 2 'Irāqs for Marwān Ibn Muḥammad Ibn Marwān Ibn AlḤakam [alKurashī (TKh) alUmawī (IKhn, TKh) adDimashqī (TKh), known as alJa'dī, and nicknamed AlḤimār (IKhn), the last Khalīfa of the Banū Umayya (IKhn, TKh), b. 72 (TKh) or 76 (Tr, IATH, ITB), a. 127, k. 132 at the age of [58 (MDh),] 59, [62 (IATH, MAB), 69 (MDh, IATH), or 70 (MDh)], was put to death by Abū Ja'far alMaṣṣar, [afterwards Khalīfa,] at Wāsiṭ in 132 in violation of a capitulation (IKb). The advice of Abū Ja'far was to keep faith with him; but Abū Ja'far's brother Abu-l'Abbās 'Abd Allāh asSaffāḥ Ibn Muḥammad [alKurashī (TKh) alHāshimī (ITB) al'Abbāsī (ITB, TKh), the 1st Khalīfa of the Banu-l'Abbās (FW, ITB), b. 108 (FW, TKh)], a. 132, d. [135 or (TKh)] 136 [at the age of 27 (TKh), 28 (Tr, IATH, FW, TKh), 29 (MDh), 32 (TKh), 33 (Tr, MDh, IATH, MAB, ITB, TKh), or 36 (Tr, IATH)], insisted upon Abū

Ja'far's putting him to death (IKhn). Marwān was called AlJa'dī [because he had learnt (IAth, MAB)] from [his preceptor and master (TKh)] AlJa'd Ibn Dirham (IAth, MAB, TKh) the doctrines of the Creation of the Qur'ān and of Predestination (IAth, MAB), etc. (IAth) : and he was known as AlHimār because of his bravery, from the saying

فَلَنْ أَصْبِرَ مِنْ حِمَارٍ فِي الْحَرْبِ *Such a one is more patient than a he-ass*

in war; for he used not to flag in waging war upon the rebels against him, and was the bravest of the Banū Umayya (TKh). It is said that AlJa'd Ibn Dirham published his doctrine of the Creation of the Qur'ān in the days of Hishām Ibn 'Abd AlMalik, under whose order he was put to death by Khālid alKaṣrī, governor of Al'Irāq (IAth). The Wāsiṭ of Al'Irāq was founded by AlHajjāj Ibn Yūsuf athThakāfi between AlKūfa and AlBaṣra; and for that reason was named Wāsiṭ, because it was intermediate between the 2 cities, [the distance from it to each being 50 parasangs (MI), i.e. leagues]: it was begun by him in 84, and finished in 86 (Mk)—l. 12. The 1st hemistich is

حَشَايَ عَلَى جِوَرٍ ذِكِّي مِنَ الْغُضَا

My heart is on glowing embers of the wood called غُضَا; and the verse is from an ode by AlMutanabbi: W says (AKB), He says My heart is on glowing embers from passion, i.e. on account of their bidding farewell and their departing; and mine eye is revelling in the face of the beloved in a garden of beauty (W, AKB). مِنْ الْغُضَا (W) for مِنْ الْهُدَى.

P. 860, ll. 2-3. بَطْنُ عَاقِلِ The bottom, or low land, of 'Āqil is [a place (MI)] on the road of the pilgrims of AlBaṣra between Rāmātān and (Mk, MI) Āmirra (Mk) [or] Immara (MI)—l. 4. 'Āqil is said to be a mountain (Bk, ZJ) that Hujr, the father of Imra alKais, used to dwell in (Bk). The author of the Mk, after enumerating 8 places named 'Āqil, the 2nd of which he describes as "a mountain that the children of [Hujr (KA)] Ākil alMurār, the ancestor of Imra alKais, "used to stop in", adds "But I do not find myself confident that they

"are 8 [separate] places; and perhaps there is some intermixture ; then;"—l. 8. See Md. II. 182 and P. II. 598—ll. 16-17. The R (vol. II, p. 142, ll.) has "either because repetition of the v. is made a "substitute for dualization of the ag.", which, though it occurs in all 3 eds., I have ventured to invert—ll. 19-20. The 2 Indian eds. of the R, (vol. ii, p. 143, l. 2) have صاحبہ his companion; but the Persian ed. has صاحبہ his 2 companions.

P. 861, l. 1. تسمیة جز باسم کل naming a part by the name of a whole (R), i.e., putting a whole for a part, as penes for penis and testicles for two testicles in the exs. given—l. 3. Read "two testicles" and "substitutions."

**A GRAMMAR OF THE
CLASSICAL ARABIC LANGUAGE**
